



**STUDIES
IN
YUGAPURĀṆA
AND
OTHER
TEXTS**

GENERAL
EDITOR
S.P. GUPTA

D.C. Sircar

STUDIES IN YUGAPURĀṆA AND OTHER TEXTS

GENERAL EDITOR

DR. S. P. GUPTA

ASSISTANT EDITORS

K. N. DIKSHIT : S. P. TIWARI

DR. DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR FELICITATION VOLUME

STUDIES IN
THE YUGAPURĀṆA
AND OTHER TEXTS

1974

PUBLISHED ON BEHALF OF
THE INDIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

PUBLISHED BY
ORIENTAL PUBLISHERS

1488, PATAUDI HOUSE, DARYAGANJ
DELHI-110006 (INDIA)

CC-0. Agamhigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh
ORIENTAL PUBLISHERS
1488, PATAUDI HOUSE, DARYAGANJ,
DELHI-110006 (INDIA)

4456

©

The Author

FIRST EDITION : 1974

Price Rs. 60.00



PRINTED IN INDIA

PUBLISHED BY INDERJEET SHARMA FOR ORIENTAL PUBLISHERS,
1488, PATAUDI HOUSE, DARYAGANJ, DELHI-110006, ON BEHALF OF
THE INDIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, C/O NATIONAL MUSEUM,
JANPATH, NEW DELHI, AND PRINTED AT PRADIP PRINTERS, DELHI-6

FOREWORD

The Indian Archaeological Society has great pleasure in offering to the scholars *Studies in Yugaṇurāṇa and Other Texts* by Professor (Dr.) D. C. Sircar. Professor Sircar's name is so well-known to scholars that one is afraid of writing anything at this time and, therefore, without elaborating the point, I would only repeat what I have said in my Foreword to Dr. Moti Chandra's book that the Society feels honoured and grateful to Professor Sircar for allowing it to publish his scholarly studies.

H. D. Sankalia

Chairman, Indian Archaeological Society

Deccan College

Poona

December 6, 1973.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

I. Birth :

Born on 8.6.1907 at Śalkāṭhi Kṛishṇanagar near the District headquarters of Faridpur in East Bengal (Bangladesh).

II. Education :

(1) B.A. (Calcutta University, 1929) with Honours in Sanskrit ; (2) M.A. (Calcutta University, 1931) in Ancient Indian History and Culture (Group IA—Epigraphy and Numismatics), First in First Class and awardee of University Prizes and gold medal ; (3) Research Scholar under Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar (1933-35) ; trained under Dr. H.C. Raychaudhuri ; (4) awardee of Premchand Roychand Studentship of Calcutta University (1934) for research work and Mouat Gold Medalist (1937) for researches carried on during studentship (1935-37) ; (5) Ph. D. of Calcutta University (1936).

III. Positions Held :

(1) Lecturer in Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University (1937-49) ; (2) Assistant Superintendent for Epigraphy (1949-53) ; (3) Superintendent for Epigraphy (1953-55) and (4) Government Epigraphist for India (1955-57, 1958-61) at Ootacamund, in the Archaeological Survey of India ; (5) Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University (1961-72) ; (6) Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University (1965-72) ; (7) Director of the Centre of Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University (1965-73).

IV. Academic Honours :

(1) Sectional President, Indian History Congress, Delhi, 1948 ; (2) President, Numismatic Society of India, Calcutta, 1955, and Agra, 1956 ; (3) President, History Section, All-India Oriental Conference, Delhi, 1957 ; (4) Chief Guest of Honour, Orissa History Congress, Bhubaneswar, 1969 ; (5) General President, All-India Oriental Conference, Ujjain, 1972 ; (6) Honorary Fellow, Numismatic Society of India, 1971, and (7) Fellow of several other Institutions in India and abroad ; (8) Recipient of Sir William Jones Memorial Medal of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1972, (9) Sectional President, Bangladesh History Congress Dacca, 1973 ; (10) Recipient of Akbar Medal of the Numismatic Society of India, 1973.

V. Lectures delivered :

(1) Carmichael Lectures, Calcutta University, 1962 ; (2) R.P. Nopany Endowment Lectures, Calcutta University, 1962-63 ; (3) Dr. R.K. Mookerji Endowment Lectures, Lucknow University, 1964 ; (4) Sir William Meyer Endowment Lectures, Madras University, 1966 ; (5) Extra Mural Lectures, Magadh University, Gaya, 1968 ;

- (6) Rai Bahadur B.M. Halwasiya Endowment Lectures, Calcutta University, 1968 ; (7) Research Lectures at the Kannada Research Institute, Karnatak University, Dharwar, 1969; (8) Extension Lectures, Mysore University, 1969 ; (9) Special Lectures at the Centre of Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University, 1970 ; (10) Extension Lectures at Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 1971 ; (11-13) National Lectures (1971-72) of the University Grants Commission at the Saugor, Jawaharlal Nehru (New Delhi) and Meerut Universities, 1972; (14) Sitarām Kohli Endowment Lectures, Punjabi University, Patiala, 1972 ; (15) Endowment Lectures at the Seth B. J. Institute of Learning and Research, Ahmedabad, 1972 ; (16) Atombapu Sharma Lectures, Imphal, 1973.

VI. Publications :

Besides more than one thousand articles, notes and reviews appearing in various periodicals in India and abroad, Sircar has to his credit other published works including the following books—(1) *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan*, Calcutta, 1935, (2) *The Early Pallavas*, Lahore, 1935 ; (3) *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan*, Calcutta, 1939 ; (4) *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1942 and 1965 ; (5) *A Grammar of the Prakrit Language*, Calcutta, 1943, and Delhi, 1970 ; (6) *The Śākta Piṭhas*, Calcutta, 1943, and Delhi, 1972 ; (7) *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, New Delhi, 1957 and 1967 ; (8) *Maski Inscriptions of Aśoka*, Hyderabad, 1958 ; (9) *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, Delhi, 1960 and 1971 ; (10) *Indian Epigraphy*, Delhi, 1965 ; (11) *The Guhilas of Kishkindhā*, Calcutta, 1965 ; (12) *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, Delhi 1966 ; (13) *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, Calcutta, 1967 ; (14) *Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India*, Vol. I—Calcutta, 1967 ; (15) *Studies in Indian Coins*, Delhi, 1968; (16) *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Delhi, 1969; (17) *Landlordism and Tenancy in Ancient and Medieval India*, Lucknow, 1969; (18) *Some Problems of Kushāṇa and Rājput History*, Calcutta, 1969; (19) *Introduction to Indian Epigraphy and Palaeography*, Calcutta, 1971; (20) *Problems Concerning the Kushāṇas*, Dharwar, 1971; (21) *Studies in the Religious Life of Ancient and Medieval India*, Delhi, 1971; (22) *Mahāmāyūrī*, Calcutta, 1972; (23) *Epigraphical Discoveries in East Pakistan*, Calcutta, 1972; (24) *Foreigners in the Ancient Punjab : The Iranians and Greeks*, Patiala, 1973; (25) *Studies in the Political and Administrative Systems in Ancient and Medieval India*, Delhi, 1973; (26) *Studies in the Yugapurāṇa and Other Texts*, Delhi, 1974. (27) *Studies in the Medieval Inscriptions of Eastern India*, 1974. Among his books in Bengali, mention may be made of the *Malañcha* and *Atiter Chhayā*.

A former Editor of the *Epigraphia Indica* and the *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, Sircar now edits the *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, of which Vols. I-VI have appeared. Other volumes edited by him include —(1) *Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1966; (2) *The Śakti Cult and Tārā*, Calcutta, 1967; (3) *The Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies*, Calcutta, 1969; (4) *Prāchyavidyā-taraṅgiṇī*, Calcutta, 1969; (5) *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography*, Calcutta, 1970; (6) *Foreigners in Ancient India and Lakshmi and Sarasvatī in Art and Literature*, Calcutta, 1970; (7) *Early Indian Indigenous Coins*, Calcutta, 1971; (8) *Social Life in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1971; (9) *Religious Life in*

Ancient India, Calcutta, 1972; (10) *Early Indian Political and Administrative Systems*, Calcutta, 1972; (11) *Trade and Industry in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1972; (12) *Early History and Culture of the Jains*, Calcutta, 1973.

VII. Foreign Visits :

(1) Represented the Government of India in a Conference on South-East Asian History at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1956; Toured Western Europe; (2) Deputed by the Government of India to the U.S.S.R., 1961; Delivered lectures at the Tashkent, Leningrad and Moscow Universities; (3) Attended the International Conference on the History and Culture of the Kushāṇas (1968) at Dushambe in Tadjikistan, U.S.S.R. (4) Visited Tribhuvan University (1969), Kathmandu, Nepal.

PROFESSOR D. C. SIRCAR

I

I was extremely glad to learn that the Indian Archaeological Society has decided to honour my old friend, Professor D.C. Sircar. His work as Government Epigraphist and as Carmichael Professor at the University of Calcutta has added immeasurably to our knowledge of India's past, in many aspects of history and archaeology.

No doubt he will be remembered primarily as a piazographer and epigraphist. It is probable that no scholar before or since, not even such famous pioneers of older times as Bühler or D.R. Bhandarkar, has had such a complete mastery over such a wide range of Indian and South-East Asian scripts as Professor Sircar. His *Select Inscriptions* forms a most valuable work of reference, which does not lose its utility with the years, and the many inscriptions which he has transliterated and edited in *Epigraphia Indica* are permanent records of his great skill and painstaking labour.

His fame does not wholly rest, however, on his work as an epigraphist. Numerous monographs, contributions to joint publications, and learned papers in many periodicals testify to his great ability in many other fields of Indology. I think particularly of his *Successors of the Satavahanas*, which I believe was his first published book. It still serves as a model for the student of pre-Muslim Indian dynastic history in the cautious and critical manner in which its author extracts historical data from inadequate epigraphical material and builds up a convincing reconstruction of the complicated history of an obscure period. His work on the *Yugapurāṇa*, etc., published piecemeal in the form of a number of separate articles, gives very convincing evidence of his ability in handling obscure and textually corrupt literary sources in a truly critical and historical spirit, and I am very glad that, to commemorate his retirement from the Carmichael Professorship, the Indian Archaeological Society has decided to reprint these articles in book form rather than republish some of his better known works, for so much rubbish has been written on the basis of the *Yugapurāṇa* that it is most desirable that Professor Sircar's scholarly studies of this source should become better known.

I have been privileged to know Professor Sircar not only as a scholar but also as a friend, and for this reason I am particularly sorry that I shall be in America at the time of the Annual Conference of the I. A. S. and cannot possibly attend it, to watch my old friend receive his Honorary Fellowship and the presentation copy of his book. But my thoughts will be with him, and I wish dear Dinesh Babu and his family every happiness in the future, and many more years of healthy, active life in which to add further to the world's knowledge of ancient India.

A.L. Basham

Professor of Asian Civilizations,
National University, Canberra
Australia

5th May, 1973.

II

Dr. D.C. Sircar is now justly regarded as the greatest living epigraphist in India and one of the most distinguished scholars in Ancient Indian History and Culture. He served in the office of the Government Epigraphist for India for eleven years and held with distinction the post of Government Epigraphist for five years. No other Editor of the *Epigraphia Indica* has personally contributed so many articles and valuable notes and comments on other's articles in that reputed Journal. Dr. Sircar served as the Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture from 1961 to 1972, and apart from the normal duties of the post, organised the Centre of Advanced Study and Research in Ancient Indian History, edited the *Journal of Ancient Indian History* and organized several seminars on various topics of interest.

Dr. Sircar is an indefatigable worker and during his active scholarly career of more than forty years has contributed a larger number of learned articles than any other Indologist, dead or alive. He has also published quite a large number of scholarly books of which the following may be mentioned as of outstanding merit which are likely to remain as standard works on the subject for many years to come: *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I (originally published in 1942 and revised in 1965), *Indian Epigraphical Glossary* (1965) and *Indian Epigraphy* (1965).

Though Dr. Sircar has retired from the post of Carmichael Professor, he is still in-charge of the Centre of Advanced Study and Research. I have known him intimately for many years and it is my firm belief that Dr. D. C. Sircar will never retire from his scholarly life so long as his health permits. I join with his other friends and admirers in praying to God that he may be spared many more years to enrich further the knowledge of ancient Indian history and culture to which he has hitherto devoted himself with an energy and ability which should be an ideal for younger generations.

R. C. Majumdar
Formerly Professor
of History and Vice-Chancellor, Dacca
University.

8-6-1973

4, Bepin Pal Road
Calcutta-26

III

While working in the Epigraphical Branch of Archaeological Survey of India, Ootacamund, I came in contact with Dr. D.C. Sircar for a few years in the early fifties. His advent to the compact research unit as a distinguished scholar from Calcutta University caused a mild stir in the calm and cool atmosphere. Particularly in my case, we met as strangers and parted as close and warmly affectionate friends. Together, we intensively deciphered and studied many North Indian Sanskrit inscriptions and critically edited a large number of articles awaiting publication for a number of years in the international quarterly, *Epigraphia Indica*. There were numerous other occasions of co-work and co-study.

I cherish pleasant and precious recollections of my association with this friend. Like others I was also impressed by his relentless zeal, untiring energy, surpassing devotion and incessant hard work. Above all was his unbiased temperament and judicious approach to research problems. He was ever willing to consult even much younger and junior members of the office and invite their views and comments. But the ultimate conclusions would always rest with him. He was free from the blemishes like self-conceit, obstinacy and superiority complex that usually comprise the concomitants of erudition. In this as well as in other academic virtues he stands high and dry. He has set a lofty example of true scholarship for younger generations to emulate.

P. B. Desai

*Formerly Professor of
Ancient Indian History and Culture and
Director of the Kannada Research Institute,
Karnatak University, Dharwar.*

IV

Even long before I had the pleasure of having his contact, Dr. D. C. Sircar's multi-faceted personality and scholarship stood revealed to me through his book entitled *The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan* and several of his articles. I could see in them the working of a very powerful and profound mind wedded to the idea of raising the standard of research by removing the chaffs and laying bare the grains from the existing output by less powerful minds. My personal association with him showed me later how he was able to achieve so much. The great achievements of Dr. Sircar, for which the world of scholars in Indian History and Culture and especially in Epigraphy are deeply beholden to him, have been possible because of his twentyfour-hour-a-day intelligent dedication to his work which has made him one of the successful modern *sādhakas* seeking after truth, whom the fingers of one's hand will be too many to count. His books, articles and notes, embracing as they do almost the entire gamut of Indian civilization through the ages, stand out as examples of solid and scintillating work displaying a rare critical acumen, originality of thinking and a crusading spirit. No wonder, therefore, that aspirants and students, who like these aspects of a scholar, flock to Dr. Sircar.

A particularly interesting aspect of Dr. Sircar's personality is that he is unable to put up with workers who are not so hardworking as he is. This is revealed by his critical appraisals of their work. But, in all fairness to Dr. Sircar, it must be stated that he never intends to minimise the efforts of others, but is interested only in offering his valuable advice, rather in an unorthodox and outspoken manner, to brother-workers to put forth their maximum and best so as to make the *śāstra* shine in all its glory. This is possible only by means of incessant *upāsana* and unceasing *yatna*, which I have known to be the main planks of Dr. Sircar's success. Apart from his chosen work, Dr. Sircar considers all other activities as not quite enjoyable and rewarding. Because of his intelligence, passionate zeal for work and supreme dedication to its cause, as I have known personally, Dr. Sircar has been able to solve many a knotty problem in Indian History and Culture and to light many a dark corner in the field of Indology in general.

As a person, Dr. Sircar is intensely humane, unreservedly friendly and uncommonly simple. These virtues naturally inspire those who come into contact with him and I, personally, have experienced the inspiration and go on extolling it. Truly, Dr. Sircar is a link in the long and unbroken chain of real *ācāryas* of our great country.

In spite of the fact that the whole world is indebted to Dr. Sircar for the many splendid *siddhantas* he has presented it by his incessant, intelligent and intuitive *sādhana*, he is sometimes regarded as wanting in refinement especially by those whom

he has found miserably wanting in several respects. If this small defect of his character could be avoided, I cannot find a better and truer *karma-yogin*, dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, than Dr. D. C. Sircar. He has often found fault with people who are shallow pseudo-scholars. Probably no purpose is served by pointing out their faults, and that too in a rather severe manner, because there were, there are and there will be such persons in the field. It seems that this has been realised by Dr. Sircar in his old age since recently he does not reply to criticisms of his own views even when the critics appear to be wrong.

I have doubts if I have been able to put in a proper manner all that I have experienced about that colossus of a scholar, Dr. D. C. Sircar. He knows very well, however, that I am his admirer because of his intelligent and scholarly *sādhakatva*, his search for truth, his marvellous exposition of the significance of historical problems and fearless enunciation of conclusions, and, above all, his humanity, friendliness and genuine goodness.

P. R. Srinivasan

*Superintending Epigraphist,
Government of India,
Mysore*

10-5-1973

Mysore

V

March 20, 1972, was the date ; 15 hrs. 38 min. the time ; and Senate Hall of the Punjabi University, Patiala, the place, when I beheld in physical form the Scholar whom I had conversed with, in imagination, for over 30 years. For, was it not that my acquaintance with him began when, during my studies for M.A. in Sanskrit at Lahore, I had to ponder over the identification of 'King Chandra of the Meharauli Pillar Inscription', and the interpretation of the phrase *pād-ānudhyāta*, etc.? The acquaintance that had so casual a beginning deepened into a sincere appreciation with the passage of time; because I could not relinquish my interest in Indian Epigraphy, and that was a field in which my Scholar appeared to me to excel all other living historians. Numismatics, at a little later stage, began to grip my attention, and my Scholar appeared to be an expert in that branch of knowledge also. That added still more to my admiration for the Scholar.

The man appeared to me to be singularly adept in raising controversies : he taught me not to take any matter for granted : acceptance should be only after a scrutiny of all the available data ; even then a room should be left for modification in the light of subsequent discovery of fresh material bearing on the problem. The controversies he engaged himself in happenend in many cases to concern matter, in which I had myself become interested during my own studenthood days. I could not agree with him on all matters at all times ; but his discussions did always open for me new avenues of thought, and that was not a small profit in itself.

The controversies he had with Dr. V. V. Mirashi appeared to me to have a particular zest ; I could early recognise that this was not because of any particular animus, but was purely a result of his search for truth, unbiased and unadulterated. I am, indeed, heartened to read his rejoinder to Dr. Mirashi's complaint, and I agree with 99% of the rejoinder which appeared in *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. IV, (1970-71), pp. 195-200.

But why is it that he feels weary of controversies now ? I must protest, and protest vehemently, against his feeling overwhelmed by wearisomeness or anything of that sort. Scholars have actively helped research till ages beyond 80 or even 90. Dr. Sircar is not so old. I know from what little I could see of him on the 20th March, 1972, that he can go as strongly for another 40 years. His controversies have helped research : they will continue to do so even in future. He should not,—must not, ought not to—retire from active research.

I wonder, if Dr. Sircar has eventually retired from the Professorship at Calcutta University. [At Patiala, he hinted that he might be retiring July end] If so, who succeeds him as 'Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture' at the University ? Does the latter *ipso facto* become

'Director of the Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC'? What becomes of the 'Journal of Arcient Indian History'—4 volumes whereof I have litetally read from cover to cover and which I consider a unique achievement? Has its 5th volume been published, with those admirable features—'Lectures at the Centre of Advanced Study', 'Monthly Seminars at the Centre' and 'Reprints' of old inaccessible articles of enduring worth, etc., etc.? Shall I be getting my copy of the 5th volume? And should I be sending my advance subscription for the next (6th) volume also? If Dr. Sircar is not at the Centre, what does he propose to do to remain in active contact with historical researches? Will he be writing something as his *magnum opus*? Can he be persuaded into writing a general 'History of Ancient India'—on a scale comparable to R. C. Majumdar's *Ancient India* or K. A. Nilakanta Sastri's *History of South India*?—surely a scale, not very ambitious, but also not very modest either.

One suggestion I have always toyed with. Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions* was being worked over by Dr. D.R. Bhandarkar when death overtook him. Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra appears to have been very leisurely working over it ever since then. Can the work not be taken over by Dr. Sircar?

Another suggestion. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. II, is yet to be published. Dr. Basham edited it for some time; then Dr. Nagendra Singh was heard to be editing it. But perhaps even God does not know what has become of the volume. Can Dr. Sircar not be made to put it in some shape?

Jinendra Sena,
Malwa Sugar Mills,
Dhuri, Punjab

8-7-1973

Dhuri

P R E F A C E

A large number of my papers appearing in various periodicals and similar publications during the past four decades relate to the date, authorship, language, style, vocabulary, and other allied aspects of particular literary works and epigraphic records as well as to the historical value of statements and traditions contained therein. The studies included in the present volume deal mostly with literary works, only a few of them containing discussions on the problems concerning certain inscriptions and other kinds of records.

This is the sixth volume in the series of my studies, the four volumes on Geography, Coins, Society and Religious Life having already appeared and another on Political and Administrative Systems going at present through the press. We shall be happy if the volume now placed in the hands of Indologists is found as useful as my published studies have been.

As in the previous volumes, here also, in some cases, two or more papers or notes have been clubbed together in one Chapter for the facility of presentation. Thus about thirty-five articles have been presented here in eighteen chapters. Some of the articles published long ago required thorough revision. I take this opportunity to express my thankfulness to the authorities of the publications in which my papers and notes originally appeared.

The sources of the various Chapters included in the volume are indicated below.

- I. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, London, 1963, pp. 7-16; *Calcutta Review*, Calcutta University, April, 1943, pp. 39-42; *Indian Culture*, Calcutta, Vol. IX, 1944, pp. 40-41.
- II. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Calcutta, Vol. XV, 1939, pp. 633 ff.; *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, Rajahmundry, Vol. XII, 1938, p. 108; *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, Vol. II, 1969-70, pp. 287-89.
- III. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XV, 1939, pp. 38 ff.; Vol. XVII, 1941, pp. 107-10; *Journal of the Greater India Society*, Calcutta, Vol. VI, 1939, p. 53; cf. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Allahabad, 1938, pp. 91 ff.
- IV. *The Bharata War and Purāṇic Genealogies*, edited by Sircar, Calcutta University, 1969, pp. 18 ff., 105 ff.
- V. *Journal of the U.P. Historical Society*, Lucknow, Vol. III, 1955, pp. 9-100; cf. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Ahmedabad, 1954, pp. 72 ff.
- VI. *Indian Culture*, Vol. VI, 1939-40, pp. 110 ff., p. 247, pp. 471 ff.; cf. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Calcutta, 1939, pp. 818 ff.

- VII. *Indian Culture*, Vol. IV, 1937, pp. 240-47.
VIII. *Epigraphia Indica*, Delhi, Vol. XXX, 1953-1954, pp. 163-81.
IX. *Essays presented to Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, edited by H.R. Gupta, Punjab University, 1958, pp. 343-47; *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, Vol. XI, 1937, pp. 61-67; *Journal of the Greater India Society*, Vol. V, 1938, pp. 59-60; *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India*, Varanasi, Vol. VI, 1944, pp. 34-36.
X. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXV, 1949, pp. 132-34; Vol. XXVII, 1951, pp. 80-82; Vol. XXIX, 1953, p. 294; *Orissa Historical Research Journal*, Bhubaneswar, Vol. I, 1952, pp. 167-70.
XI. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXX, 1953-1954, pp. 210-19.
XII. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXIX, 1951-1952, pp. 178-82.
XIII. *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Calcutta, Letters, Vol. XX, 1954, pp. 201-08.
XIV. *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*, Patna, Vol. XLV, 1954, pp. 29-30; *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Poona, Vol. XXXIII, 1952, pp. 218-21.
XV. *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Vol. IV, 1962, pp. 9-16, pp. 105 ff.
XVI. *Journal of Indian History*, Kerala University, Trivandrum, Vol. XXXI, 1953, pp. 233-46.
XVII. *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Vol. IV, 1962, pp. 141 ff.
XVIII. *Folklore*, Calcutta, Vol. VI, 1965, pp. 5-6, 57-58, 208-09, 294-95; *Prag-jyotiṣa*, Gauhati, 1965, pp. 24 ff.

If blemishes are noticed in the book, the readers may kindly draw the author's attention to them, so that the defects may be rectified in the following edition.

645, New Alipore,
Calcutta-53.
January, 26, 1973.

D. C. SIRCAR

GENERAL EDITOR'S NOTE

Studies in the Yugapurāṇa and Other Texts by Prof. D. C. Sircar is the second volume in the Felicitation Series of the Indian Archaeological Society. Prof. Sircar's name, needless to say, is now the by-word for scholarship in the field of epigraphy. He is an institution in himself; the number of his publications runs in hundreds and scholars nurtured by him now occupy important chairs in several Indian universities and research institutions. The depth of his scholarship and the breadth of his vision know no bounds; his *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, *The Śākta Piṭhas*, *The Select Inscriptions*, *Studies in the Political and Administrative Systems in Ancient and Mediaeval India* (in press) are only a few of his great works.

He has long been head and shoulder above others in seminars and symposia: what he knows others have not known. In one of his rare nostalgic moods he told me 'my dear young friend, rather youngest friend, may I tell you what I used to be and what I am now..... In conferences and congresses I always roared, I now seldom speak. Of late, I really feel that in the past I created more enemies than friends and life is not worth living without friends'. Only a couple of days ago he was sitting in my office room complaining against his physicians who have strictly forbidden him to read and write late in the night and also in the noon. He said, 'now seven hours a day which I always fruitfully utilized are wasted only in morning walks and afternoon nap in the bed.'

'But you are hardly the person who would bow down to such dictates'. I provoked him a little. 'You are right, but for my wife. If I fear anybody I fear only her'. At last, I felt, here was a giant who too fears some one.

During the last few years, I have now known him, I have discovered an entirely new D. C. Sircar, a most humane amongst the humans and a most loving and inspiring individual. His devotion to learning is absolutely single-minded and admits no distraction, even good food, which he likes so much. How we wish we have amongst us only a few more Sircars to provide real bone to Indological studies in this country which is so rich in epigraphical records.

Here I would like to record my deep sense of gratitude to my young colleague in the museum, Sri S. P. Tiwari, now in Amsterdam, who had put in considerably hard labour to see a large portion of this book through the press. I am equally beholden to Sri Nag Sharan of the Oriental Publishers for preparing the Index, and to Mr. Inderjeet Sharma for bringing out this volume in comparatively very short time.

In felicitating Professor Sircar, and his wife, who has always been sustaining him so well, by republishing some of his very important papers in this volume we know we are sharing the sentiments of at least two living generations of historians of ancient and mediaeval Indian history and epigraphical records.

20.11.1973

S.P. GUPTA

*National Museum
New Delhi*

C O N T E N T S

CHAPTERS	PAGES
I. Problems of the Yugapurāṇa ...	1
II. Date of the Mahābhāṣya and Nāṭyaśāstra ...	17
III. Introduction of Classical Sanskrit in Epigraphic Records ...	25
IV. Traditions about the Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies ...	35
V. Past-Perfect in Samudragupta's Eraṇ Inscription ...	47
VI. The Chandaḥsūtra and Chandomakhānta ...	55
VII. Kāvya Style in the Post-Śatavāhana Epigraphs ...	61
VIII. Lexical Value of Viṣṇuṣeṇa's Charter ...	69
IX. The Guptas in the Tiloyapaṇṇattī, Kaumudīmahotsava and Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa ...	87
X. Abhinanda, Bhavadeva and Puruṣottama ...	99
XI. Chittapa's Praśasti of the Sun-god of Bhilsa ...	107
XII. Introductory Part of a Kāvya ...	117
XIII. Abbreviations in Viśvarūpasena's Charter ...	123
XIV. The Māgarājapaddhati and Vaidyahrdayananda ...	131
XV. Jivadeva's Bhaktibhāgavata ...	135
XVI. Pre-Suryavarṇśī Orissa in the Mādala Pāñji ...	149
XVII. Two Bengali Documents of the Eighteenth Century ...	159
XVIII. Some Folktales and Folksayings ...	169
Published Works of Dr. D. C. Sircar	I—XXVI
INDEX	i—viii

CHAPTER I

Problems of the *Yugapurāṇa*

It is now well known to the students of early Indian history that the *Yugapurāṇa* section of the *Gārgīśaṃhitā* contains a valuable account of the Yavanas or Indo-Bactrian Greeks. The importance of the account lies in the fact that it speaks of a Yavana invasion of Puṣpapura (*i.e.* the city of Pāṭaliputra which was the capital of the Mauryas) and some other areas, apparently forming parts of the Maurya empire, and assigns it to a date shortly after Śāliśuka who was a descendant of Aśoka and flourished about 200 B. C.¹ The Yavana invasion of Pāṭaliputra thus took place about the time when the Brāhmaṇa general Puṣyamitra killed his master, the latest Maurya king Brāhadratha, and occupied the Maurya throne about 185 B. C. There can be little doubt that the success of the Greeks against the Mauryas is intimately associated with the dynastic revolution and that the rise of Puṣyamitra was a result of the Greek occupation of Maurya territories.

There are five manuscripts of the *Yugapurāṇa* section referring to the Yavanas :

(1) Manuscript in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. Cf. K. P. Jayaswal in *JBORS*, Vol. XIV, pp. 400ff. ; D. R. Mankad in *JUPHS*, Vol. XX, 1947, pp. 32-48, and also *Yugapurāṇam*, Vallabhvidyanagar, pp. 25ff.

(2) Manuscript in the Banaras Sanskrit College (now Varanasi Sanskrit University). Cf. Jayaswal, *loc. cit.*; Mankad, *loc. cit.*

(3) Manuscript in the possession of D. R. Mandad. Cf. Mankad, *loc. cit.*

(4) Manuscript noticed by H. Kern (now lost). Cf. Kern, *The Bṛhatsaṃhitā of Varāhamihira*, Bibliotheca Indica, 1864-65, Introduction, pp. 32-40; Jayaswal, *loc. cit.*; Mankad, *loc. cit.*

(5) Manuscript in the Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris. Cf. K. P. Jayaswal, *JBORS*, Vol. XV, pp. 129ff.; Mankad, *loc. cit.*

A number of writers, especially those who have dealt with the history of the Indo-Bactrian Greeks, have tried to utilise the information supplied by the *Yugapurāṇa*. Cf., besides references to the notices of the manuscripts quoted above, A. Cunningham, *Coins of Alexander's Successors in the East*, pp. 262-63; E. J. Rapson, *Ancient India*, pp. 131-32; K. H. Dhruva, *JBORS*, Vol. XVI, pp. 18ff.; V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, 4th ed., p. 228 and note 1; H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of*

1. A section in six lines (3 *Anuṣṭubh* stanzas) immediately before the reference to the Yavanas describes Śāliśuka (cf. *JBORS*, Vol. XIV, p. 401). See V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, 1924, p. 228, note 1. See also below, pp. 12 ff. (p. 13).

Ancient India, 6th edition, pp. 386, etc.; W. W. Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, pp. 452ff.; D. C. Sircar in *Calcutta Review*, April, 1943, pp. 39-42, and in *The Age of Imperial Unity (The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. II)*, ed. R. C. Majumdar, pp. 106-07; A. N. Lahiri, *IHQ*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 40ff.; A. K. Narain, *The Indo-Greeks*, pp. 174ff.; etc. But the language of the stanzas in the *Yugapurāṇa* being corrupt in many places, there is no unanimity among scholars regarding their interpretation. There are also variants in the reading of some passages and, in some cases, one variant has been accepted by some and another by others. It has to be admitted that a few authors have resorted to wild guesses on the basis of an unsatisfactory study of this section.

The lines of the *Yugapurāṇa* referring to the Yavanas are in the prophetic style of the *Purāṇas*. They are in two groups separated by 13 lines describing the condition of the people in the Kali age.² The two sub-sections, marked A and B, are quoted below.

A

- (1) *Tataḥ Saḥetam*=*ākramya Pañcālān*=*Mathurām*³ *tathā*|
- (2) *Yavanā duṣṭa*⁴-*vikrāntāḥ*⁵ *prāpsyanti Kusumadhvajam*⁶||
- (3) *Tataḥ Puṣpapure prāpte kardame*⁷ *prathite hite*⁸||
- (4) *ākulā viṣayāḥ sarve bhaviṣyanti na saṁśayaḥ*||
- (5) *śāstra-druma*⁹-*mahāyuddham tad*=*bhaviṣyati paścimam*¹⁰||

B

- (1) ¹¹*Dhamamīta-tayā*¹² *vyddhā janām bhokṣanti*¹³ *nirbhayāḥ*|
- (2) *Yavanā*¹⁴ *kṣapayīṣyanti*¹⁵ *nagare*¹⁶ *pañca*¹⁷ *pārthivāḥ*¹⁸||

2. Cf. *JBROS*, Vol. XIV, pp. 402-03.

3. Kern—*Pañcālān*=*Mathurām*; other mss.—*Pañcālā Mathurā*.

4. Asiatic Society and Kern—*Yavanā duṣṭa*^o; Bibliothèque Nationale—*evanā yuṣṭa*^o; Banaras Sanskrit College—*evanā duṣṭa*^o; Mankad—*Yavanāṣ*=*ca su*^o.

5. Mankad—^o*vikrāntāḥ*; other mss.—*vikrāntā*.

6. Asiatic Society and Bibliothèque Nationale—^o*dhvajā*; other mss.—*dhvajam*.

7. Bibliothèque Nationale—*kardama*^o; other mss.—*kardame*.

8. Bibliothèque Nationale—*hate*.

9. Asiatic Society and Banaras Sanskrit College—*śaduma*; Bibliothèque Nationale—*śastraduma*; Mankad—*śastradrumā*.

10. This line has not been quoted from Kern's manuscript.

11. This line and the following one have not been quoted from Kern's manuscript.

12. Asiatic Society and Banaras Sanskrit College—*Dhamamīta-tamā*; Bibliothèque Nationale—*Dharmamī-tatayā*; Mankad—*dharmā-bhita-tamā*. Mankad refers also to the reading *Dhamamīta-tacā*, though it is not clear where he got it.

13. Asiatic Society and Banaras Sanskrit College—*bhokṣanti*; Bibliothèque Nationale—*mokṣanti*; Mankad—*bhokṣyati*.

14. Bibliothèque Nationale—*Pañcālā*; other mss.—*Yavanā*.

15. Asiatic Society and Banaras Sanskrit College—*jñāpayīṣyati*; Bibliothèque Nationale—*jñāpayīṣyanti*. Mankad's manuscript seems to have *kṣapayīṣyanti* though he has attributed this reading wrongly to other manuscripts. Cf. the same mistake in Narain's *The Indo-Greeks*, p. 178.

16. This reading is found only in the Bibliothèque Nationale manuscript. See note 17 below.

17. Kern—*naṣyeraṇ ca*; Asiatic Society and Banaras Sanskrit College—*naṣare yaṁ ca*; Mankad—*nagareḥ pañca*; Bibliothèque Nationale—*nagare yaṁ ca*.

18. Mankad—*pārthivā*; other mss.—*pārthivāḥ*.

- (3) *Madhyadeśe*¹⁹ *na sthāsyanti Yavanā*²⁰ *yuddha-durmadāḥ*²¹/
 (4) *teṣāṃ*=*anyonya-sambhāvā*²²=*bhaviṣyati*²³ *na saṁśayah*||
 (5) *ātma-cakr-otthitāṁ ghorāṁ yuddhāṁ parama-dāruṇāṁ*²⁴||
 (6) *tato yuga-vaśāt*=*teṣāṁ Yavanānāṁ parikṣaye*²⁵/
 (7) *Sakete*²⁶ *sapta rājāno bhaviṣyanti*²⁷ *mahā-balāḥ*||

It will be seen from the lines quoted above and the indication of the variant readings in the foot-notes (1) that some of the passages are the same in all the manuscripts (cf. line 4 of A), (2) that some of them are grammatically wrong or contain a palpable error in all the manuscripts (cf. lines 1 and 7 of B) and (3) that some others are grammatically correct in some manuscripts (or in a single manuscript) but wrong elsewhere (cf. lines 2 and 6 of B). The wisest policy to deal with the text would therefore be to accept the readings which are grammatically correct and to emend the faulty readings, to the smallest extent possible, in order to get a good sense.

Line 1 of A as found in Kern's manuscript is grammatically correct and means, 'then, having occupied (or, invaded) [the city of] Sāketa, [the country of] Pañcāla and [the city of] Mathurā', or 'then having occupied (or, invaded) [the cities of] Sāketa and Mathurā from Pañcāla'. The invaders are the Yavanas as indicated in line 2 of A. It is interesting in this connection to note that Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* refers to the Yavana invasion of Sāketa during the life-time of the author²⁸ who was a contemporary of Puṣyamitra Śuṅga (c. 185-150 B. C.) since the *Mahābhāṣya* refers to its author as having officiated in a sacrifice performed by Puṣyamitra.²⁹

Sāketa and Mathurā were respectively the capitals of the Uttara-Kosala and Surasena *janapadas* of the Maurya empire, Pañcāla being another of its *janapadas*. While leading an expedition against the Maurya empire, the Yavanas may have invaded the said three territories more or less simultaneously or the Pañcāla country may have been occupied by them first and Sāketa and Mathurā later from their bases in Pañcāla. With the decline of Maurya imperial authority after Aśoka (c.269 232 B. C.), the provincial rulers at Sāketa, the Pañcāla capital (Ahicchatra) and Mathurā appear to have been ruling semi-independently.

The reading *Pañcāla Mathurā tathā* in line 1 of A requires the correction *Mathurās=tathā* in order to yield the sense, 'then the Pañcālas (i.e. the Pañcāla people) and the Mathuras (i.e. the people of Mathurā) having invaded Sāketa'. The

19. Asiatic Society and Bibliothéque Nationale—*madhye*; Kern and Banaras Sanskrit College—*madhyam*; Mankad—*Madhya*°.
 20. Bibliothéque Nationale—*Pañcālā*°; other mss.—*Yavanā*°.
 21. Mankad—*durmadāḥ*; other mss.—*durmadā*.
 22. Banaras Sanskrit College—*sambhāva*; Bibliothéque Nationale—*sambhavo*; Kern and Asiatic Society—*sambhāvā*; Mankad—*sambhāvā*°.
 23. Kern—*bhaviṣyanti*; other mss.—*bhaviṣyati*.
 24. Asiatic Society—*dāruṇāṁ*; other mss.—*dāruṇāṁ*.
 25. Asiatic Society and Bibliothéque Nationale—*parikṣayam*; Kern, Mankad and Banaras Sanskrit College—*parikṣaye*.
 26. Asiatic Society, Kern and Bibliothéque Nationale—*sāmkete*; Banaras Sanskrit College—*Sakete*; Mankad—*saketo*.
 27. Mankad—*bhaviṣyati*; other mss.—*bhaviṣyanti*.
 28. Cf. *arunad*=*Yavanah Sāketam* (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VII, p. 267; *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini, III. 2. 111).
 29. Cf. *iha Puṣyamitraṁ yājñamaḥ* (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. I, p. 300; *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini, III. 2. 123).

mention of the Yavanas in line 2 of A would of course suggest that the joint invaders of Śāketa were the Pañcālas, Māthuras and Yavanas. The defects of this interpretation are the following : (1) it involves a correction in the text ; (2) the *Mahābhāṣya* at least corroborates the Yavana invasion of Śāketa, while the invasion of Śāketa by the Pañcālas and Māthuras is as yet unknown from any other source ; (3) as will be seen below, the whole section appears to deal with the exploits of the Yavanas alone, the Māthuras being never mentioned again while the Pañcālas are mentioned in two corrupt passages of a single manuscript, which, moreover, do not clearly suggest their alliance with the Yavanas.

Of course one may be inclined to take *Mathurām* from Kern's manuscript and *Pañcālā*^o from the others, to read *Pañcālā Mathurām* and to suggest that Śāketa and Mathurā were invaded jointly by the Yavanas and Pañcālas. But the position of the word *tathā* does not make that interpretation quite happy. We will also see below that the passage *Madhyadeśe na sthāsyanti* (line 3 of B) suits the Yavanas and not the Pañcālas and Māthuras and that the reference to the *ātma-cakr-otthita yuddha* (line 5 of B) tallies very well with the known facts of the history of the Indo-Bactrian Greeks while there is as yet no evidence regarding an alliance of the Yavanas with the Pañcālas or with the Pañcālas and Māthuras and a subsequent war between the two or among the three peoples. Moreover, the last verse of the section (lines 6-7 of B) speaks of the *parikṣaya*, 'disappearance [from Madhyadeśa] (or, destruction),' of the Yavanas alone.

Line 2 of A as found in most of the manuscripts means "the viciously valiant Yavanas will reach (or, seize) Kusumadhvaja". The reading *Yavanās=ca su-vikrāntāḥ* is also grammatically correct ; but the word *ca* would probably suggest the invaders to have been the Yavanas together with the Pañcālas or with the Pañcālas and Māthuras, and we have already noted the defects of that interpretation. Kusumadhvaja may have been the name of an unknown locality on the Yavanas' 'way from the west of Puṣpapura (i.e. Pāṭaliputra) mentioned in line 3 of A or it is the same as Kusumapura or Puṣpapura, 'the flower-city', i.e. the city of Pāṭaliputra which was the capital of the Mauryas.

Kusumadhvaja (literally, 'one having the flower-banner') is sometimes used as a name of the Indian god of love whose commoner appellation is Mīnadhvaja or Makaradhvaja. We have also reference to a ruler probably as *puṣpa-dhvaja-lāñchana*, 'one having the banner and crest of flower'.³⁰ Thus Kusumadhvaja in the *Yugapurāṇa* may have primarily been the name of a deity and secondarily that of the locality where he was worshipped. The name 'flower-city' applied to Pāṭaliputra may suggest that 'the deity with the flower-banner' was its guardian. If that was the case, his shrine may have been at the gate of the city. If the variant *°dhvajā* is supposed to indicate that the feminine form of the expression was intended by the author, the reference may be to a female divinity. The association of the name *Pāṭaliputra* or *Pāṭaliputra*³¹ with a Yakṣī named Pāṭali or Pāṭalī is not inconceivable.³²

30. Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 132, text line 1 and note.

31. Cf. *ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, p. 222, text line 16 ; p. 224, text line 11.

32. For traditions regarding the origin of the name, cf. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, s.v.; Altekar and Mishra, *Kumrahar Excavations*, p. 14; etc.

Line 3 of A, which is grammatically correct and is the same in four out of the five manuscripts, may be differently interpreted. It may be : *tataḥ kardame hite prathite Puṣpapure prāpte*, 'then the celebrated Puṣpapura, set in mud (i.e. encircled by mud-walls), having been reached (or, seized) [by the Yavanas]', or *tataḥ prāpte prathite Puṣpapure kardame hite*, 'then the celebrated Puṣpapura, reached (or, seized) [by the Yavanas], having been set [by them] in mud (i.e. encircled by them in mud-walls)'. If *hi* and *te* are read separately, *te* will have to be taken with *viṣayaḥ* in line 4 of A. In that case, the second alternative interpretation would be unsuitable. The reading *hate* is not quite satisfactory. The word *prathita*, which has been taken above to mean 'celebrated' and as an adjective of Puṣpapura, can also be taken to be an adjective of *kardama* in the sense of 'spread out' or 'stretched'. Since *prathite* is somewhat distant from *Puṣpapure*, this appears to be better, though it does not change the position to any considerable extent.

The first of the alternative interpretations of the passage quoted above is, however, defective since it involves tautology, the arrival at or the seizure of Kusumadhvaja, if regarded as identical with Puṣpapura, being already mentioned in line 2 of A. But it is quite satisfactory if Kusumadhvaja is regarded as different from Puṣpapura or the verb *prāp* is taken to mean 'to reach' in the first case and 'to seize' in the second, or if we have *hite kardame prāpte*, 'the spread out mud (i.e. mud-walls) having been occupied'. The difference between the two interpretations quoted at first is this : the first would suggest that the city of Puṣpapura was surrounded by mud-walls before the Yavanas occupied it, while the second would indicate that the Yavanas themselves erected mud-walls, for defending themselves, in addition to the original walls of the city.

Line 4 of A is also grammatically correct and is found in all the manuscripts. There is again no difficulty about its meaning. It says, "there is no doubt that all the provinces [of the Puṣpapura empire] will be in disorder [as a result of the Yavana occupation of Puṣpapura or of Puṣpapura being disconnected by the Yavanas from the rest of the empire by fresh mud-walls]."

In line 5 of A, the first four *akṣaras*, said to read *śastra-druma* in one manuscript, appear to be erroneous, although it is difficult to suggest any satisfactory emendation. But *paścimam* in the same line is certainly the correct reading and not *pañcamam*. As it stands, the line means, "then there will be subsequently a great war (or, battle) with missiles and trees." A reference to fighting with trees as weapons does not appear to be satisfactory. We may suggest the emendation *śastra-bhūma* for *śastra-druma*, and this would imply that the war or battle in question was characterised by the use of the number and variety of weapons. Whatever, however, be the nature of the struggle, it appears that the Yavana occupation of the Maurya capital was followed by a fierce battle or a war lasting for some time between the invaders and the Maurya forces.

Lines 1-2 of B, which have not been quoted from Kern's manuscript, are the most difficult to tackle in the whole section on the Yavanas. Most of the words have variant readings and, even if many of them are intelligible, a suitable meaning of the lines on the whole is not quite apparent.

The verb in line 1 of B is *mokṣanti* (for *mokṣyanti*) or *bhokṣanti* (for *bhokṣyanti*), while its object is *janam* in all the manuscripts in which the stanza occurs,

The passage *mokṣyanti janam* would mean '[they] will liberate the people', while *bhokṣyanti janam* seems to mean '[they] will eat up (i.e. oppress) the people'. But the epithet *nirbhayāḥ* 'fearless', applied to the subject of the verb, suits *bhokṣyanti* better than *mokṣyanti*, since 'they will oppress the people fearlessly' appears to yield a sense more suitable to the context than 'they will liberate the people fearlessly'. It has also to be noticed that the letter *bha* is found in the word in three manuscripts in place of *ma* found in only one. The subject of the verb is of course the invaders of Puṣpapura.

In the expression *dhāmamītatamā* or *dharmamītatayā* of the same line, *dhāmamīta* contains the words *dhama* (blowing) and *mīta* (dead) which together as a compound expression do not yield any satisfactory sense. But, since this awkward expression is found at least in two manuscripts out of the four containing the verse, this has to be regarded as the intended reading and not *dharmamīta* (one who died in the cause of *dharmā*) or *dharmabhīta* (one who is fearful of *dharmā*) which clearly exhibits a case of the less familiar being superseded by the familiar. If this is accepted, the apparently meaningless *Dhāmamīta* should better be regarded as the Indianised form of a personal name like Greek *Demetrius* in the absence of any easier way of explaining it. As *tama* (same as *tamas*) means 'darkness', *Dhāmamīta-tamā* as a compound word would not yield any suitable sense. But *taya* means 'a protector'³³ or 'protection' and *Dhāmamīta-tayā*^o, even though it is not very happy because of its want of simplicity which characterises the language of the section, may mean 'those who have their protector in *Dhāmamīta*', i.e. 'those who are under the protection of *Dhāmamīta*', *vrddhā*^o in the same context meaning 'those who have become prosperous'. Thus *Dhāmamīta-tayā vrddhā*^o together would mean 'those who have prospered on account of the protection of *Dhāmamīta* or *Demetrius*'. We may also suggest the emendation *Dhāmamīta-tayā(d*)*^o, 'as a result of the protection offered by *Dhāmamīta*', or *Dhāmamīta-taya-vrddhā*^o as a compound word in the same sense, or *Dhāmamīta-ta(na)yā(d*)*^o, or *Dhāmamīta-tayā(naya)*^o, 'as a result of *Dhāmamīta*'s [good] policy'.

This would of course suggest that the Indo-Bactrian Greeks who invaded Puṣpapura were led by *Demetrius* (c. 190-165 B. C.), son of *Euthydemus* (c. 215-190 B. C.), that they prospered under the leadership of *Demetrius* and that they oppressed the people of Puṣpapura occupied by them and the adjoining areas under their sphere of influence.

In line 2 of B, *nagare* occurring in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* manuscript and *pañca* in *Mankad's* manuscript must be regarded as the correct readings. *Nagara* was one of the well-known names of the city of Puṣpapura or *Pāṭaliputra*.³⁴ Thus the line apparently refers to some act of (or, relating to) the foreign invaders of Puṣpapura in that city.

The verb in this line is found as *jñāpayiṣyanti*, '[they] will announce', and possibly also as *kṣāpayiṣyanti*, '[they] will burn' in one manuscript. Though *kṣāpayiṣyanti* involves the addition of a *visarga* after the previous word *Yavanā* or *Pañcalā*,

33. Cf. *Kirātārjunīya*, XV, 20, and *Mallinātha's* commentary thereon.

34. Cf. *Nāgarakāḥ*, *Nāgarikāḥ* and *Nāgarikyāḥ* explained respectively as *Pāṭaliputrakāḥ*, *Pāṭaliputrikāḥ* and *Pāṭaliputrikyāḥ* in the *Jayamaṅgalā* commentary on *Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra*, VI, 5, 30; 9, 24.

considering the reference to the oppression of the people by the invaders in the previous line and the possibility of a confusion between *kṣa* and *jña* in the Nāgarī alphabet, *kṣāpayiṣyanti* may be the intended reading as 'they will burn' appears to offer an idea more suitable to the context than 'they will announce', especially when we cannot guess what the nature of this announcement could have been. The previous word is *Yavanā* or *Pañcālā*. If the first reading is preferred, we have of course to correct it to *Yavanāḥ* before *kṣāpayiṣyanti*. But, in case the second word is preferred, it would better be corrected to *Pañcālān*. The last word of this line is *pārthivā* or *pārthivāḥ* which would yield a satisfactory sense if corrected to *pārthivān*.

It will thus be seen that we are inclined to emend line 2 of B either as *Yavanāḥ kṣāpayiṣyanti Nagare pañca pārthivān*, "the Yavanas will burn [alive] five [captured] rulers at Nagara," or as *Pañcālān kṣāpayiṣyanti Nagare pañca pārthivān*, "[the invaders] will burn [alive] five [captured] Pañcālā rulers at Nagara." The difference between the two interpretations is that the first would mean the burning of five unspecified captured rulers by the Greeks in occupation of Puṣpapura, while the second would suggest that the said five rulers all belonged to the Pañcālā country. But, as will be seen below, between the two, the first alternative interpretation is preferable.

Another possible emendation of the line is *Yavanān kṣāpayiṣyanti Nagare pañca pārthivāḥ* meaning either "five [allied Indian] rulers will burn the Yavanas at Nagara" or "the [Indian] rulers will burn five Yavanas at Nagara". It will be seen that this emendation offers us the reason why the Yavanas left Madhyadeśa as referred to in the next line (line 3 of B) and also helps us in bringing Puṣyamitra Śuṅga into the picture as one of the Indian rulers who burnt the Yavanas at Pāṭaliputra. This would then refer to the re-occupation of Pāṭaliputra by Puṣyamitra and his allies. But, if this emendation has to be accepted, we have to take the expression *Dhamamīta-tayā vṛddhā*° in the previous line (line 1 of B) as the subject of the verb *bhokṣyanti* in the sense of '[the people, i.e. the Yavanas] who will be prosperous under Dhamamīta's protection.' This, however, does not appear to be very happy considering the simple Purāṇic style in which the section is written.

It may be noted that, while most manuscripts read *Yavanā*° in both lines 2 and 3 of B, one manuscript has *Pañcālā*° in both the places. As will be seen below, the context shows that *Yavanā*° is the correct word in line 3 of B and not *Pañcālā*°. It may, however, be argued that an author would not repeat the same word (*Yavanā*°) in two consecutive lines (lines 2 and 3 of B) and one may consider it better under the circumstances to have the name of the Pañcālās in line 2 of B. But, even in that case, the language of the said line can scarcely be so interpreted as to suggest that the Pañcālās were allied with the Yavanas. It is difficult to believe, in the present state of our knowledge, that the Pañcālās have been described as having prospered under the protection of Dhamamīta or Demetrius. Thus the acceptance of the mention of the Pañcālās in line 2 of B would not help us in preferring the reading *Pañcālā*° to *Pañcālān* in line 1 of A. Moreover, if the subject of the verb *bhokṣyanti* in line 1 of B is to be traced in line 2 of B, *Yavanāḥ* in that line is a more suitable reading than *Pañcālān*.

In this connection, it may also be noted that the atrocities perpetrated by the Yavanas in India are well known to the Purāṇic writers. Cf.

*Bhaviṣyant=īha Yavanā dharmataḥ kāmato=rthataḥ/
n=aiva mūrdh-abhiṣiktās=te bhaviṣyanti narādhipāḥ/
Yuga-doṣa-durācārā bhaviṣyanti nṛpās=tu te/
strī-bāla-go-vadham kṛtvā hatvā c=aiva parasparam//
bhokṣyanti Kali-śeṣe tu vasūdhām pāṛthivās=tathā*³⁵

"The Yavanas will be [present] here for [the propagation of] their religion, [the enjoyment of] pleasures and [the accumulation of] wealth. They will certainly not be crowned kings. The said rulers will perform evil deeds under the influence of the age (*i.e.* the Kali age). And killing women, children and cattle and slaughtering one another, those rulers will rule the earth in the concluding part of the Kali [age]."³⁶ The idea contained in the passage *hatvā c=aiva parasparam* here is remarkably corroborated by lines 4-5 of B to be discussed below.

There is not much difficulty with line 3 of B since *madhyam deśe* or *madhye deśe* in it is clearly a mistake for *Madhyadeśe* occurring in one manuscript. The line means, "the Yavanas, ferocious in battle, will not stay in Madhyadeśa." According to Manu (II. 21), Madhyadeśa was the name of the central tracts of Northern India extending from Eastern U. P. to the Eastern Punjab, while Buddhist works include Bihar in Madhyadeśa.³⁷ Since the section under study speaks first of the Yavana occupation of Puṣpapura or Pāṭaliputra in Bihar and then of their departure from Madhyadeśa, the name Madhyadeśa has no doubt been used here in its wider Buddhist sense.

It will be seen that one manuscript mentions *Pañcalā*^o instead of *Yavanā*^o of the other manuscripts. Since, however, the Pañcalā country lay within Madhyadeśa itself, to say that 'the Pañcalas will not stay in Madhyadeśa' does not appear to be suitable to the context. On the other hand, since the Yavanas came to Madhyadeśa from Uttarāpatha lying beyond the Eastern Punjab, to say that 'they will leave Madhyadeśa' would mean that they would return to their own land in Uttarāpatha. This interpretation also seems to be clearly supported by lines 4 and 5 of B discussed below.

In line 4 of B, the most important expression is *anyonya-sambhāva*. The word *bhāva* means 'feeling' and *sambhāva*, 'intense feeling'. Thus *anyonya-sambhāva* would mean 'intense feeling against one another'. The correct reading would be *teṣām=anyonya-sambhāvo bhaviṣyati* or *°sambhāva bhaviṣyanti*, 'there will be intense feeling or [ill] feelings against one another among themselves,' or *°sambhāvād=bhaviṣyati*, 'out of the intense ill-feeling among themselves, there will be [yuddha or war mentioned in line 5 of B].

35. Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 56 and note 4.

36. That the Greeks perpetrated such atrocities is also known from other instances. Cf., e.g., the massacre of the Mālavas by Alexander's soldiers—"sparing neither man, woman, nor child" (Smith, *Early History of India*, 1924, p. 101).

37. Kājāṅgala (near modern Rajmahal on the eastern border of Bihar) was regarded by the Buddhists as the eastern limit of Madhyadeśa though sometimes the boundary was further extended towards the east as far as Puṇḍravardhana (modern Mahasthan in the Bogra District in North Bengal, now in Bangladesh). See Sircar, *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, p. 17.

There is no difficulty with line 5 of B which means, "there will be the most fierce [and] terrible war arising in their own circle, realm or land." The internecine struggle amongst the Indo-Bactrian Greeks, between the partisans of Demetrius and those of Eucratides (c. 175-150 B. C.) in the first half of the second century B. C., is well known to all students of early Indian history and need not be discussed here.³⁸ It will be seen that the reason why the Yavanas 'will' leave Madhyadeśa, i. e. 'will' go back to their own land in Uttarāpatha, is explained in lines 4 and 5 of B as the great struggle that 'will' develop in their country as a result of mutual ill feelings among themselves.

There is also no difficulty with line 6 of B which means, 'then the disappearance [from Madhyadeśa] (or, destruction) of the said Yavanas resulting from the influence of the age (i. e. time, or the evil effects of the Kali age)'. It has to be noticed that the reference is here to the disappearance or destruction of the Yavanas alone and mention is made in this connection neither of the Pañcālas nor of the Mathuras. This would show that no alliance of the Yavanas with the Pañcālas or with the Pañcālas and Mathuras should be inferred from lines 1-2 of A discussed above.

In line 7 of B, *Sakete* and its variants are clearly wrong, and we have to read here *Sakete*, 'at Saketa', the city of Saketa being already mentioned in line 1 of A as having been subdued by the Yavanas. It is thus not unnatural for the author to tell us what happened to Saketa after the disappearance of the Yavanas, and he says, "there will be seven mighty kings at Saketa." This means that seven kings successively ruled at Saketa after the end of the Yavana occupation of the place.

We now quote the verses again in the versions accepted by us with our small emendations wherever absolutely necessary for making the text intelligible and free from grammatical errors and also with our translation thereof.

TEXT

A

Tataḥ Sāketam=ākramya Pañcālān=Mathurām tathā/
Yavanā duṣṭa-vikrāntāḥ prāpsyanti Kusumadhvajam|| 1
Tataḥ Puṣpapure prāpte kardame prathite hite/
ākulā viṣayāḥ sarve bhaviṣyanti na saṁśayaḥ||
śastra-dru(bhū)ma mahāyuddham tad=bhaviṣyati paścimam|| 2

B

Dhamamīta-tayā vṛddha janāṁ bhokṣa(kṣya)nti nirbhayāḥ/
Yavanā(h*) kṣāpayiṣyanti Nagare pañca pāṛthivā(n*)|| 1
Madhyadeśe na sthāsyanti Yavanā yuddha-durmadāḥ/
teṣām=anyonya-saṁbhāvād=bhaviṣyati na saṁśayaḥ/
ātma-cakr-otthitāṁ ghorāṁ yuddham parama-dāruṇam|| 2
Tato yuga-vaśāt=teṣām Yavanānām parikṣaye/
Sa(Sa)kete sapta rājāno bhaviṣyanti mahā-balāḥ|| 3

38. Cf. *Cam. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 446 ff.; Smith, *Early History of India*, 1924, pp. 237-38; Sircar in *The Age of Imperial Unity*, ed. Majumdar, pp. 108-09.

TRANSLATION

A

1. Then, having occupied [the city of] Śāketa, [the country of] Pañcāla and [the city of] Mathurā (or, having occupied [the cities of] Śāketa and Mathurā from [their bases in] Pañcāla), the viciously valiant Yavanas will reach (or, seize) Kusumadhvaṇa.
2. Then, when the occupied [city of] Puṣpapura will be set in extended mud (i.e. spread out mud-walls) (or, when the stretched out mud or mud-walls at Puṣpapura will be reached or occupied), all the provinces [of the Maurya empire having its capital at Puṣpapura] will be undoubtedly in [complete] disorder. Then, there will be subsequently a great war (or, battle) in which a large number of weapons will be used.

B

1. Prospering under the protection of Dhamamīta (Demetrius), the Yavanas will eat up (i.e. oppress) the people [and] will burn [alive] five rulers at Nagara (i.e. Pāṭaliputra).
2. The Yavanas, fierce in fight, will not stay in Madhyadeśa. As a result of strong mutual [ill] feelings [developing] amongst them, there will no doubt be an extremely terrible [and] fierce war arising in their own realm.
3. Then, the disappearance of the said Yavanas resulting under the influence of the age (i.e. time, or under the evil effects of the Kali age), there will be seven mighty kings at Śāketa.

In this connection, we may draw the attention of scholars to two other points, the first of which relates to the mention of a *stūpa* built by king Milindra (Menander, c. 115-90 B.C.) at Pāṭaligrāma (Pāṭaliputra) in the *Stūpāvadāna* section of Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (LVII. 13-15). It seems that there were two Greek invasions of Pāṭaliputra, one led by Demetrius about the beginning of the second century B.C. and another led by Menander about the close of the same century. It further appears that the first invasion resulted in the overthrow of the Mauryas by Puṣyamitra, while the second compelled the later Śuṅgas to repair to the Malwa region and led to the rise of their feudatories as independent powers issuing their own coins in various parts of Bihar and U.P.⁴⁰

We would also draw attention to a passage in Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa's *Harṣacarita*, referring to the murder of the last Maurya king Bṛhadratha by his general Puṣyamitra

40. Strabo says, 'Of the eastern parts of India, then, there have become known to us all those parts which lie this side of the Hypanis (Viprāsā) and also any parts beyond the Hypanis, of which an account has been added by those who, after Alexander, advanced beyond the Hypanis, as far as the Ganges and Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra).'" "The Greeks who occasioned its (Bactria's) revolt became so powerful by means of its fertility and the advantages of the country that they became masters of Ariana and India, according to Apollodorus of Artemita. Their chiefs, particularly Menander (if he really crossed the Hypanis to the east and reached Isamus) conquered more nations than Alexander. These conquests were achieved partly by Menander, partly by Demetrius, son of Euthydemus, of the Bactrians." See R.C. Majumdar, *The Classical Accounts of India*, pp. 257. 286.

who succeeded his master on the throne of Pāṭaliputra. G. Bühler's quotation of the passage and his translation of it run as follows :-

*pratijñā-durbalaṃ ca bala-darśana-vyapadeśa-darśit-āśeṣa-sainyaḥ
senānir=anūryo Mauryaṃ Bṛhadrathaṃ pipeṣa Puṣyamitraḥ svāminam,*

"And reviewing the whole army under the pretext of showing him his forces, the mean general Puṣyamitra crushed his master Bṛhadratha, the Maurya, who was weak of purpose."⁴¹

It has to be admitted that most of the manuscripts of the *Harṣacarita* read *prajñā-durbala* ('one who is weak in intelligence', i.e. 'a foolish person') in place of *pratijñā-durbala*.⁴² It seems, however, that *prajñā-durbala*, more easily intelligible to the readers than *pratijñā-durbala* which cannot be understood without a knowledge of the nature of Bṛhadratha's *pratijñā*, was substituted for the latter by the commentators. Thus there seems to be a case here of the supersession of the unfamiliar by the familiar, and *pratijñā-durbala* may be the original reading of the expression in question. This expression has been translated by Bühler as 'one who is weak of purpose',⁴³ though its correct translation appears to be 'one who is weak (i.e. exhibits weakness) in respect of his agreement, vow, assertion or declaration', i.e. 'one who is too weak to keep a promise'. The translation of *bala*, in the passage *bala-darśana vyapadeśa-darśit-āśeṣa-sainya*, as 'forces' seems also to be wrong since showing 'the army' on the pretext of reviewing 'the forces' is not quite happy. The word *bala* here certainly means 'strength' which is suitable to the context especially because *bala* was required by Bṛhadratha described as *durbala* [in respect of his *pratijñā*].

We have no means to determine what *pratijñā* of Bṛhadratha is referred to by Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa. But it can be easily imagined that, when the Greeks were in occupation of the Maurya capital and the people of the city and its neighbourhood were being oppressed by the cruel foreigners, Bṛhadratha, who failed to defend his capital, protect his subjects from oppression by the invaders and drive the foreigners out of his capital and other parts of his empire, became quite unpopular with his subjects and that this was the reason behind the ease with which his general succeeded in disposing him of. If Puṣyamitra had by that time gained even a little success against the foreigners, it would have certainly made him popular. In such a position, it is possible to explain the meaning of *pratijñā-durbala* in an intelligible way.

It appears that Puṣyamitra showed his eagerness to fight with the foreigners, but that his master was not hopeful of his success against the Greeks,⁴⁴ even though he had

41. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. II, p. 363.

42. Cf. Śaṅkara's commentary in Parab's edition. A rare unsatisfactory alternative reading in the passage is *daṁṣita* for *darśita* (cf. Rāṅganātha's commentary in the University of Kerala Sanskrit Series, No. 187, p. 301).

43. The expression has also been translated as 'one who is weak in keeping his coronation oath' (Smith, *Early History of India*, 1924, p. 208, note 1).

44. Cowell and Thomas take *bala* in the sense of 'his (Puṣyamitra's) power' (*The Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa, p. 193).

45. Cf. the popularity and unpopularity respectively of Candragupta and Rāmagupta in the story of the *Devicandragupta*. While Candragupta was eager to fight with the Śakas, Rāmagupta was in favour of making peace with the foreigners at any cost. It is interesting to note that Rāmagupta was likewise murdered by Candragupta without any difficulty. See Sircar, *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, pp. 138 ff. In his reference to the Candragupta-Rāmagupta story, Bāṇa apparently depended on the *Devicandragupta*. There was probably another work on the Puṣyamitra-Bṛhadratha episode, which was available to Bāṇa. See below, p. 19.

declared his intention to drive out the invaders at an earlier stage. Probably he was now living in a temporary capital more or less safe from the Greeks and was hesitant to offer provocation to the foreigners to fall upon his new abode. If he did not feel himself strong enough to launch an attack against the Greeks, Puṣyamitra might have tried to convince him of the strength of the Maurya forces by parading the entire army before Br̥hadratha. In that process, if the army would express their displeasure with the king and their appreciation of the general in any way, it was of course very easy for the latter to dispose of his master on the parading ground itself.

We are therefore inclined to translate the above passage as follows : "And, as he was parading the entire [Maurya] army [before Br̥hadratha] on the pretext of exhibiting its strength [in order to convince the king of the prowess of his forces], the ignoble general Puṣyamitra crushed his master Br̥hadratha, the Maurya, who was [too] weak to keep his promise [to fight or repulse the Yavanas or to save or rescue his subjects from the oppression of the Yavanas]."

There is little doubt that Puṣyamitra succeeded in freeing the Maurya capital from the Yavana invaders as also Mathurā, Sāketa, the Pāñcala country and other areas of Madhyadeśa occupied by the Yavanas for sometime. It is also certain that, in this, he received considerable help from the turn of events. The fierce struggle between the partisans of Demetrius and Eucratides must have drawn most of the Indo-Bactrian warriors to Uttarāpatha from all parts of Madhyadeśa, and this made Puṣyamitra's task easier, though he appears to have taken many years in reoccupying the entire Madhyadeśa. The fact reminds us of the struggle among Alexander's lieutenants after their master's death in 323 B.C., which drew the Greek combatants stationed in the subjugated areas of North-Western Bhāratavarṣa to Western Asia and resulted in the loss of those regions for the Greek empire.⁴⁶ Thus history repeated itself in the liberation of Madhyadeśa from Indo-Bactrian subjugation in the first half of the second century B.C.

II

In the history of Indological researches, we often notice that a mistake or conjecture of one author is immortalised by later writers on the subject. Today one writer offers a conjectural suggestion as not wholly absurd ; tomorrow another scholar will come forward to colour it by his own imagination and to say that the theory is very probable ; and the next day a third writer will take that hypothesis to be an already established fact.⁴⁷ In a paper entitled '*Dharmavijaya and Dhammavijaya*',⁴⁸ K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has unfortunately brought at one stretch the hypothetical suggestions of a previous writer to the third stage of evolution. In this case, K. H. Dhruva's emendations in some verses of the *Yūgapurāṇa*, which are admittedly tentative and conjectural, have been accepted by Sastri as perfectly convincing.

Sastri quotes the following line from the *Yūgapurāṇa* : *sthāpayiṣyati mohātma vijayaṁ nāma dhārmikam* (i.e., the fool will establish the so-called conquest of Dharma),

46. Cf. *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 429.

47. See Sircar, *Successors of the Sātavāhanas*, 1939, pp. 63-66.

48. *Calcutta Review*, February, 1943, pp. 114f.

and remarks, "the line applies, in fact, as K. H. Dhruva has shown convincingly, to Śālīśūka and to his rule in Surāṣṭra as viceroy under his brother Samprati, when he forcibly converted the whole land to Jainism by suppressing the sacrificial religion altogether."⁴⁹ It is well known to the readers of Dhruva's paper⁵⁰ that the said scholar made such fanciful emendations as the following : *Śīsunāga-kule...Udayo* for *Śīsunāg-ātmajo...udadhī* (ll. 8-9), *Śakalam* for *Saketam* (l. 22) and *Śakale* for *Sakete* (l. 36), *Puṣyamitreṇa* for *Āgnivaiśyās=tu* (l. 51), *Kalīngān samupasthitaḥ* for *vināśe samupasthite* (l. 54), *Vasumitrāt* for *Āgnivaiśyāḥ* (l. 90), etc. Moreover, he rearranged the lines of the original text in his own ingenious way in the following order : lines 1-26, 41, 79-82, 42-52, 83-93, 107-109, 61-69, 110, 70-78, 53-57, 104-105, 64, 58-60, 94-103, 27-33, 36-37, 35, 34, 38, 40, 113-115, 111-112. Considering the nature of the emendations as well as the peculiar arrangement of the lines, the value of Dhruva's reconstructed text appears to us to be not greater than that of Roberto de Nobili's *Ezourvedam*.⁵¹ It is apparently for this reason that the suggestions have so far been ignored by many of the scholars who have written on the subject.

Let us, however, consider the section in which the verse referred to by Sastri occurs. In Dhruva's reconstructed text,⁵² lines 16-21 are as follows :—

tasmin Puṣpapure ramye janārāma⁵³-śat-ākule/
 kratu-karma-kṣay-ākūtaḥ⁵⁴ Śālīśūko bhaviṣyati||
 sa rājā karma-nirato⁵⁵ duṣṭ-ātma priya-vigrahaḥ/
 Saurāṣṭram=ardayan⁵⁶ ghoram dharmā-vādī hy=adhārmikaḥ⁵⁷||
 svam jyeṣṭham⁵⁸ bhrātaram sadhum Sampratim prathayan guṇaiḥ⁵⁹/
 sthāpayiṣyati mohātma vijayam nāma dhārmikam||

It will be seen that in the original text referred to by Kern, there is no reference to Samprati, Surāṣṭra and the Jain community which are all taken by Sastri from the conjectural emendations of Dhruva. It will also be seen that, following the line

49. *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

50. *JBORS*, 1930, pp. 18ff.

51. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 13, note.

52. Dhruva's translation of the concluding passage runs as follows : "[The wicked Śālīśūka will] proclaim the so-called religious conquest, contributing thereby to the glorification of his elder brother Samprati by sections of the Jain community." It is not only the result of considerable tampering with the original text, but is also confusing. If both of them were Jains, why is Samprati praised as *sādhu* and Śālīśūka condemned? How could the wicked and irreligious policy of Śālīśūka contribute to *Dharmavijaya* and to the glorification of the religiousness of his elder brother? Moreover, the context seems to support the reading *sva-rāṣṭram*. The next verse reads :—

tataḥ Sāketam=ākramya Pañcālan Mathurām tathā/
 Yavanā duṣṭa-vikrāntā prāpaṣyanti Kusumadhvyajam||

The author seems to suggest that the disturbances in the empire which were the result of Śālīśūka's bad policy encouraged the Greeks to fall upon it. They conquered Sāketa, Pañcāla and Mathurā and then advanced even against Pāṭaliputra, the capital of the empire. The correction *hy=adhārmikaḥ* is unnecessary. This sort of *viśandhi-dōṣa* is very often noticed in the epics and the Purāṇas. See, e.g., *Matsya Purāṇa* quoted in *Suc. Sat.*, p. 94.

53. Original text : *ramyajanaśajā*; Kern : *°rāja* (?).

54. Original text : *rbhukṣā karmasūtaḥ*.

55. Original text : *°sūto*.

56. Original text : *sva-rāṣṭram=ardate*.

57. Original text : *adhā°*.

58. Original text : *Sa jyeṣṭha°*.

59. Original text : *ketiti prathitam guṇaiḥ*; Kern—*hatvā vi* (?) for *ketiti*.

of Dhruva, one can interpolate into the text the name of any person or place of any age or country. Critical scholarship should hesitate to suggest conjectural emendations, at least in such passages as *sva-rāṣṭram*=*ardate ghoram dharma-vādī adhārmikah* which yields a perfectly satisfactory sense. And Sastri should not have passed off Dhruva's conjectural emendations as a faithful representation of the original text of the *Yugapurāṇa*. To Dhruva's credit, it must be said that his own remarks are sufficient to prove the speculative and inconclusive character of the emendations suggested by him. He says, "The emendation *janārāma* in line 16 for *janarāja* which is difficult to construe is one which will recommend itself as being easy to interpret. The case of *r̥bhukṣā karmasūtaḥ* in the next line is somewhat different. It is to be discarded, no doubt, because it conveys no meaning and at the same time makes the line metrically faulty. But the restoration of the right reading is rather taxing to the brain. The lines that come after throw some light, and with their help I have proposed to read *kratu-karma-kṣay-ākūtaḥ*. The word *sūto* in line 18 defies all attempt at interpretation. I have substituted *nirato* tentatively for want of a better one, to make the metrically faulty line run smooth and to remove the obscurity. The Present *ardate* in line 19 ill suits prophetic statements. I have replaced it by the Participial Adjective *ardayan*. By this change, lines 18-21 are made to go together and form a simple sentence so that *sa* of line 20 becomes superfluous. It seems to me that in reality the scribe has unknowingly interchanged the initial letters of lines 19 and 20. To set right the mistake, I propose to read the first terms as *Saurāṣṭram* and *svam̐ jyeṣṭham* respectively in the said lines. Mr. Jayaswal has pointed out the relationship of Śaliśūka and Samprati. In accordance with the said relationship, I have suggested the reading *Sampratim̐* in place of *ketiti* in line 20."⁶⁰ No comments are necessary on the above passage as it speaks for itself.

Sastri does not believe that the pacifist policy of Aśoka was in any way responsible for the downfall of the Maurya empire. He, therefore, criticizes Jayaswal and Raychaudhuri who hold Aśoka at least partly responsible. But Sastri does scant justice to the author of the *Political History of Ancient India* (4th ed.), when he says "from the references given by both these writers, I am led to think that support for this line of criticism is sought from a misquotation based on misunderstanding of a line in the *Yugapurāṇa* of the *Gargisamhitā*."⁶¹ It is hardly justifiable to bring the charge of misquotation and misunderstanding against writers who have rightly ignored the tentative readings and conjectures of Dhruva and accepted the version of the original manuscript as quoted by Kern. Moreover, Raychaudhuri has quoted the *Yugapurāṇa* passage just to compare the policy, attributed to Śaliśūka and commented on in the *Yugapurāṇa*, with that of Aśoka who was its real initiator as we learn from epigraphic records of the family. He has also adduced other evidences regarding the causes of the downfall of the Maurya empire. "The royal hunts and the jousts of arms in *samājas* were abolished. The army seems to have been practically inactive during the last twenty-nine years of the reign as the emperor himself declares with a feeling of exultation that 'the sound of *bheri* had become the sound of the True Law, *Dharma*. The Chinese *Hou Han-shu* testifies to the fact that the people of India 'practise the religion of the Buddha; it has become a habit with them

60. *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

61. *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

not to kill and not to fight.'⁶² The ease with which the general Puṣyamitra overthrew his king in the very sight of the army shows that, unlike the earlier kings of the dynasty who took the field in person, the last of the Mauryas lost touch with his fighting forces and ceased to command their affection. The largesses of gold lavished on the *religieux* must also have crippled the financial resources of the empire. The system of autonomous Rājukas instituted by Aśoka must have let loose centrifugal forces that his successors were unable to check."⁶³ "He called upon his sons and even grandsons to eschew new conquests, avoid the shedding of blood and take pleasure in patience and gentleness."⁶⁴ "Some of Aśoka's descendants (e. g. Jalauka) set up independent sovereignties, and were thus responsible for the dismemberment of the empire."⁶⁵ "The disintegration which set in before 206 B. C. was accelerated by the invasions led by the Yavanas referred to in the *Gārgisamhita* and the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. The final *coup de grace* was given by Puṣyamitra."⁶⁶

In conclusion, we cannot help commenting on another argument of Sastri. He remarks, "Aśoka is blamed for having weakened the Maurya empire by his pacifism. Did Aurangzeb, who spent a whole lifetime in war, leave the Mughal empire stronger and render the task of his successors easier?" But this is a wrong analogy. No historian has ever opined that all empires of the world declined on account of the same cause. The downfall of the Mughul empire may have been partly due to Aurangzīb's militarist policy which drained the resources of the state; but there are other rulers (e.g., Akbar, Śivājī, Dalhousie and others) who followed a policy of war with different results. The failure of the last great Mughul is no argument to disprove that the strongest of the factors that led to the decline of the Maurya empire was Aśoka's policy of pacifism.

Without realising our point of view that there may be sound policies other than Aśokan pacifism and Aurangzīb's militarism, Sastri elsewhere says, "The fact that he (Aśoka) held the empire together for nearly a generation after he renounced war and fresh conquests by war is sufficient proof of his efficiency."⁶⁷ The question is, however, not whether Aśoka was an efficient ruler, but whether he did or did not sow the seeds of the decline of the Maurya empire. It is not material whether the consequences of a policy were apparent during the life time of the initiator of that policy or sometime after his death. Aurangzīb was an efficient monarch, and he left the empire almost intact at his death. This, however, does not prove that Aurangzīb's policy, as students of history would agree, was not in any way responsible for the fall of the Mughul empire.

There is, moreover, another important side of the question. In the present state of our knowledge, it is not possible to prove that Aśoka was able to hold the

62. Cf. *CII*, Vol. II, Part I, p. lxvii.

63. *Op. cit.*, p. 304, note 3.

64. *Op. cit.*, p. 304.

65. *Loc. cit.*, note 1.

66. *Op. cit.*, p. 305.

67. *Calcutta Review*, April, 1943, pp. 39-43. See p. 43.

empire unimpaired upto the time of his death. According to the testimony of the Buddhist and Brahmanical traditions, Aśoka ruled for 36 or 37 years. The pre-coronation period of four years is added to the above reign period by some scholars, but is included in it by others.⁶⁸ Whatever course may be followed, it should be noted that no record of the emperor dated after he was 'anointed 27 years' is as yet known. This absence of records of the last six or ten years of Aśoka's reign may be significant. In any case, however, we have to wait for further evidence and, until that is forthcoming, we cannot be sure about the conjecture that the emperor did not himself suffer from the effects of his policy of pacifism.

68. Cf. Sircar, *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, pp. 47, 62; Smith, *Early History of India*, 1924, pp. 206-07; *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 698; etc.

CHAPTER II

Date of the Mahābhāṣya and Nāṭyaśāstra

I

Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* is one of the earliest literary records of India, which contain a number of quotations from a few works written in a developed *kāvya* style. The date of the work is, therefore, intimately connected with the growth and popularity of artificial poetry in India. The date of both Patañjali and his *Mahābhāṣya* has been discussed by a number of scholars.¹

Bühler² was not very sure of the generally accepted date of Patañjali, i.e. the 2nd century B. C., which is arrived at from the grammarian's supposed contemporaneity with Puṣyamitra Śūṅga (c. 185-50 B.C.). Winternitz says, "As regards placing Pāṇini in the 5th century, Kātyāyana in the 3rd and Patañjali in the 2nd, it is only a working hypothesis."³ Barth pointed out, "Side by side with these citations (*iha Puṣyamitraṁ yājayāmaḥ*, etc.), there are others which appear to have a much more modern stamp," and observed, "... the chronological edifice Pāṇini-Kātyāyana-Patañjali—a very fragile edifice... Patañjali later and probably much later than the middle of the 2nd century before our era. . . ."⁴

Barth's observation seems to be true. While some passages of the *Mahābhāṣya* point to an early date, others appear to be much later. This fact may possibly suggest that there is some truth in the tradition regarding the *Mahābhāṣya* having been lost and revived.⁵ The work in its present form does not appear to be much earlier than the Kuṣāṇa period.

The *Mahābhāṣya* knows very well not only the *Mahābhārata* and the *Hari-vaiṣṇava*, but also a number of classical *kāvyas* (from which verses are quoted) which

1. A bibliography of the writings on the subject is given by Winternitz, *Gesch. d. Ind. Litt.*, Vol. III, pp. 387-90. (Eng. trans., Vol. III, Part II, pp. 429ff.). This bibliography has been brought up to date by L. de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas*, etc., pp. 199-200.
2. *Ind. Insch. u. alt. Kun.*, p. 72; Eng. trans. (*Indian Inscriptions and the Antiquity of Indian Artificial Poetry*, ed. Sircar), Calcutta, 1970, pp. 81-82.
3. *Op. cit.* (German) p. 390; Eng. trans., p. 430.
4. Poussin, *op. cit.*, p. 201.
5. Cf. *Rājatarāṅginī*, IV. 483; also I. 176 and IV. 636.

are based on them.⁶ Citations like —

prathate tvayā patimatī pṛthivī;⁷
na varṭtate cakram=iṣur=na pātyate;
na syandante saritaḥ sāgarāya;
kūṭastho='yam loko na viceṣṭit=āsti;
yo hy=evam paśyati so='py=anandhaḥ;⁸

and many others of this kind no doubt point to a flourishing state of the classical *kāvya* literature. It is of course difficult to say whether the word *sāgara* in the line quoted above indicates that its author lived after the epic legend of Sāgara and his sons had become famous. Verses quoted in the *Mahābhāṣya* offer specimens of such classical metres as *Mālatī*, *Praharṣiṇī*, *Pramitākṣarā*, *Vasantatilakā*, etc. This fact may point to a date not much earlier than the later strata of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (completed about the 2nd century A. D.) and the *Mahābhārata* (completed about the 4th century A. D.). What is, however, more interesting is that the *Kārikās* (dealing with grammatical points), mostly quoted from the author's predecessors, are written in such ornate metres as *Indravajrā*, *Upajāti*, *Śālīnī*, *Vaiśasthavila*, *Samānī*, *Vidyumālā*, *Toṭaka*, *Dodhaka*, etc.⁹ We know that Sanskrit was at first a language of the grammarians, and the origin of the Classical metres must have been due to their experiments. But can we believe, without further evidence, that such metres were used in the 3rd century B. C. (long before the final shaping of the epics), which should be the date of the predecessors of a contemporary of Puṣyamitra?

The *Mahābhāṣya* is later than the poet who wrote *Janārdanas=tv=atma-caturtha eva*.¹⁰ This poet therefore knew the fully developed form of the *Vyūha* doctrine of the Viṣṇu-worshippers. The Nanaghat inscription¹¹ of Nāgannikā (1st century B.C.) begins with adoration to Dharma, to Indra, to Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva, to the Moon and Sun,¹² and to the *Lokapālas* Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera and Vāsava. The significant omission, from this list, of Pradyumna and Aniruddha appears to prove that the full-fledged *Vyūha* doctrine was unknown at the time of the Nanaghat inscription at least in the Maharashtra region where the record has been found. The *Mahābhāṣya* by an author who was an inhabitant of Gonarda lying between Ujjayinī

6. Cf. Asi-dvitiyo='nusaśara Pāṇḍavam, Saṅkarṣaṇa-dvitiyasya balaṁ Kṛṣṇasya vardhatām. etc., (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 426). There are quotations from the Purāṇas and possibly also from the epics or an early version of the *Manusmṛti*. The verse *Vātāya kapilā vidyud=atapāy=atilohinī/ pītā bhavati sasyāya (kṛṣṇā sarva-vināśāya) durbhikṣāya sitā bhavet* (ibid., p. 449) is said to belong to the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (S.C. Sen, 'Metereological Concepts of the Ancient Hindus', *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, Vol. XXIX, p. 3); cf. also the verses *Trīṇi yasy=āvadātāni vidyā yonis=ca karma ca/ etac=chivāṁ vijānīhi Brāhmaṇ-āgrasya lakṣaṇam* (Kielhorn, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 220); *Tapah śrutam ca yonis=c=ety=etad=Brāhmaṇa-kāraṇam/ tapah-śrutābhyām yo hīno jāti-Brāhmaṇa eva sah* (ibid., Vol. I, p. 411; Vol. II, p. 363); *Dūrād-āvasathān=mūtram dūrāt pād-āvasacanam/ dūrāc=ca bhāvyaṁ dasyubhyo dūrāc=ca kupīad=guroh* (ibid., p. 457), etc.

7. Kielhorn, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 216.

8. Ibid., p. 123.

9. See Keith, *Hist. Sans. Lit.*, 1928, p. 47.

10. Kielhorn, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 143.

11. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 192 ff.

12. Bühler read *camṇa-sutanām*, 'to the descendants of the Moon'; but the correct reading is *camṇa-śūranām*, 'to the Moon and Sun (śūra)'. See *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., p. 193.

and Vidiṣā in Malwa in West India therefore seems to be later than a poet who may not be earlier than the 1st century B. C.

The *Mahabhaṣya* mentions Kāñcīpura¹³ and Nāsikyanagara,¹⁴ which point to a date not much earlier than the 2nd century A. D. There is no mention of Kāñcīpura in any early work. It seems to be rather significant that Ptolemy, who mentions even ordinary market places in the south-eastern coast of India, does not mention Kāñcīpura in his *Geography* (c. 145 A. D.). Nāsikya was the later name of the place which was called Govardhana as late as the 2nd century A.D. That it was a holy *tirtha* is proved by the inscriptions¹⁵ of Śaka Rṣabhadatta, son-in-law of the Satrap Nahapāna (119-24 A. D.). Immediately after this prince, the Govardhana district with its head-quarters at the city of the same name passed to the Śātavāhanas.¹⁶ In the inscriptions of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi and his son Puṣyamai, both of whom lived in the first half of the 2nd century A. D., Govardhana is always the name used. That, however, the name Nāsikya was gradually becoming popular about the middle of that century may be regarded as indicated by the fact that Nasik is mentioned in Ptolemy's *Geography*; but doubts have been expressed regarding the identification of Ptolemy's Nasik with the present Nasik.¹⁷ It must also be noted that neither Govardhana nor Nāsikya is mentioned in the *Tirtha-yātrā* sections in the Vana-parvan of the *Mahabharata*. This possibly shows that the place was not famous even in the early centuries of the Christian era.

The *Mahabhaṣya* quotes a poet who wrote, *Mahīpāla-vacaḥ śrutvā jughuṣuḥ Puṣya-mānavāḥ*,¹⁸ 'having heard the king's speech, Puṣya's (i.e. Puṣyamitra's)¹⁹ boys uttered a cry'. It has been supposed to be a citation from some work, the theme of which was the revolt of Puṣyamitra Śūṅga and the death of the last Maurya king.²⁰ If this suggestion be accepted, our *Mahabhaṣya* should be placed considerably after the time of Puṣyamitra's *coup d'état*. We are not inclined to suggest that *iha Puṣyamitraṁ yajayamaḥ*, etc., were also quoted from the same work or copied from some earlier grammatical work as *mūrdh-abhiśikt-odāharāṇa* or stock illustration. It seems to us better to suggest that Patañjali was himself a contemporary of Puṣyamitra Śūṅga, but that his work, the original *Mahabhaṣya*, was revised and enlarged by early grammarians of his own school.²¹

13. *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 298.

14. *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 42.

15. See Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, p. 168. Govardhana was the name of the city and the district around it.

16. See the Nasik inscriptions of the Śātavāhana king Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, *ibid.*, pp. 198, 200; cf. p. 207.

17. Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, p. 117, note 1.

18. Kielhorn, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 288.

19. This is a *nām-aika-deśa* like *Bhīma* for *Bhīmasena*, and *Satyā* or *Bhāmā* for *Satyabhāmā*.

20. Poussin, *loc. cit.* See also our remarks above, p. 11, note 45.

21. Some other old works which had additions at the hands of later authors of the same school are Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* and Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. See below for the *Kāmasūtra* and *Nāṭyaśāstra*. As regards the *Arthaśāstra*, Smith (*E. Hist. Ind.*, 1924, p. 161) says, "I have pointed out that the contents describe the state of things existing immediately before the establishment of the Maurya empire, while Mr. Shamasastri suggests that it may refer back even to the pre-Buddhist age. The book seems to be based on much more ancient treatises now lost and a good deal of it must have been archaic in Maurya times." This view is as unacceptable as that of Johnston and

In a long explanatory note on Pāṇini's *Sūtra* (II. 4. 10) *Śūdrāṇām* = *aniravasita-nām*, the *Mahābhāṣya* distinctly says that the Śakas (Scythians) and Yavanas (Greeks) were *aniravasita* (pure) Śūdras²² and that they lived outside Āryāvarta which is defined as the land bounded by the Himavat in the north, the Pāriyātra in the south, Adarśa (Vinaśana near Kurukṣetra) on the west and Kālakavana in the east.²³ Those Śūdras are *aniravasita* who are not 'excluded from the dish,' i.e., who could take food from the dish of any twice-born person without making it permanently unclean so as to be thrown away. The said passage of the *Mahābhāṣya* also indicates that the social position of the Śakas and Greeks was much higher than that of the Cāṇḍālas and Mṛtapas who could not take food from the dish of a *dvija* without making it permanently unclean, and also considerably higher than that of the Takṣans (carpenters or stone-cutters), Ayaskāras (blacksmiths), Rajakas (washermen) and Tantuvāyas (weavers) who could take food from a *dvija*'s dish without making it permanently unclean, but could not perform sacrifices. According to the *Mahābhāṣya*, therefore, the Scythians and Greeks were not only considerably Hinduised, but were amongst the best of the Śūdra classes and were possibly allowed to offer sacrifices.²⁴ When could the

(Contd. from page 19)

Jolly (cf. *JRAS*, 1929, pp. 27ff.) that Kauṭilya, Cāṇakya or Viṣṇugupta is a fictitious figure. The testimony of the Purāṇas and other works (though not contemporaneous) regarding Kauṭilya's connection with Candragupta Maurya (c. 324-300 B.C.) may be disregarded only on definite negative evidence. Absence of reference to Kauṭilya in early works like the *Milindapañha* is no definite proof. Kauṭilya appears to have been the founder of a new school of political philosophy, and the *Arthaśāstra* may be the work of this school. Many of its views may be ascribed to Kauṭilya; but the book in its present form is post-Christian. The reference to Cina (II. 11), derived from the name of the Tsin dynasty, suggests a date not earlier than the latter half of the 3rd century B.C. The language and structure of the work as well as reference to the system of dating in terms of regnal year, month, fortnight and day (II. 6) is not much earlier than the 2nd century A.D. which is the date of the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman. The mention of Svārṇabhūmi (II. 11) and Kambu, i.e., Kambuja or Cambodia (II. 13) seems to point to a similar age. Nepāla mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* (II. 11) is found for the first time in the Allahabad pillar inscription of the 4th century A.D. On the use of dates in early Indian inscriptions, see below, p. 29. Winternitz refers the *Arthaśāstra* to the third century A.D. (*Hist. Ind. Lit.*, Vol. III, trans., pp. 593, 624) and Kieth to 'c. A.D. 400 or even later' (*Hist. Sans. Lit.*, p. 469).

22. See Sircar, *Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India*, Vol. I, pp. 48, 63ff.; also *The Successors of the Satavāhanas*, pp. 321ff.
23. This Āryāvarta, the conception of which is borrowed from the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra* (I. 2. 2. 9ff.), is the same as Madhyadeśa of the *Manusmṛti* (II. 21)—the land bounded by the Himavat, Vindhya, Prayāga and Vinaśana. Manu's Āryāvarta is bounded by the Himavat, Vindhya, Pūrva-samudra (Bay of Bengal) and Pāścima-samudra (Arabian Sea). The stereotyped system of naming members of the different *Varnas* as evidenced by the following verse of the *Manusmṛti* (II. 32):

*śarmavad=Brāhmaṇasya śyād=rājño rakṣā-samanvitam/
Vaiśyasya puṣṭi-saṃyuktam Śūdrasya praiśya-saṃyutam||*

proves that the work in its present shape is not earlier than the 3rd century A.D., because inscriptions prove that this system is later than the 2nd century. The present text of the *Mahābhāṣya* may be placed about a century earlier than the *Manusmṛti*.

24. It is interesting that the *Manusmṛti* points to almost the same status of the said peoples in Indian society. According to Manu (X. 43-44), the Śakas and Yavanas were originally Kṣatriyas who were degraded to the position of the Śūdra; cf.

*śanakais=tu kriyā-lopād=imāḥ Kṣatriya-jātayaḥ/
Vṛsalatvaṃ gata loka Brāhmaṇ-ādarsanena ca||
Paundrakāśc=Audra-Draviḍāḥ Kambojā Yavanāḥ Śākāḥ/
Pārada Pahlavāś=Cināḥ Kirātā Daradāḥ Khasāḥ||*

In the same context, reference should also be made to the *Gautama Dharmasūtra* (IV. 21), according to which the Yavanas sprang from the union of the Kṣatriya male and Śūdra female. See Sircar, *Stud. Soc. Adm. Anc. Med. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 214 (note 2), 131 (note 3); *CHI*, Vol. I, p. 240.

Sakas attain to such respectable rank in the Hindu social system? Even if we accept Sten Konow's identification of the Sai-wang of the Chinese historians with the Indian Śaka-muruṇḍa, we come to a period definitely later than the time of Puṣyamitra. According to the Chinese chronicles, about the second quarter of the 2nd century B.C., the Ta Yue-tchi were defeated by the Hiung-nu, emigrated to the west and subjugated the Ta-hia; thereupon the Sai-wang went to the south and ruled over Ki-pin (Kāpiśa or Kafiristan in North-Eastern Afghanistan). But this Sai occupation of Kāpiśa must be posterior to the reign of Eucratides (c. 175-156 B.C.) and his immediate successors.²⁵ Then we have to allow some time for the Śakas to be considerably Hinduised so as to be recognised as pure Śūdras. However short this period of time may be, the present *Mahābhāṣya*, on this ground, is to be placed long after 150 B.C. It is possible that the *Mahābhāṣya* passage refers to a period after the early Śaka kings, such as Maues (Moga) who began to rule in the first century B.C.²⁶ If the place where the Śakas lived and which was outside Āryāvarta refers to Scythia of the *Periplus* and Indo-Scythia of Ptolemy, it lay in Uttarāpatha which was included in Āryāvarta for the first time in the age of the *Manusmṛiti*. The Yavana country is known to have been in the north-western part of India, also included in Uttarāpatha.

4456. The *Mahābhāṣya* (under Pāṇini, V.1.77) quotes a *Vārttika* which mentions the South-East Asian localities called Ajapatha and Śaṅkupatha, also known from a few other works.²⁷ Such knowledge of the geography of South-East Asia is usually assigned to the early centuries of the Christian era.²⁸

These are a few of the points that appear to us to point to a later date for the present text of the *Mahābhāṣya*—a date not much earlier than the 2nd century A.D. The arguments may not be altogether beyond doubt; but they are sufficient to raise a suspicion regarding the ascription of the entire *Mahābhāṣya*, as we have it now, to the 2nd century B.C.

II

M. Ghosh published an interesting paper entitled 'Date of the *Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra*' in the *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, Vol. XXV, 1934. He concluded, "the present text of the *Nṣ* existed in the second century after Christ, while the tradition may go back to a period as early as 100 B.C."²⁹ Recently the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (Chapters I-XXVII) edited and translated by the same scholar has been published by Minisha Granthalaya, Calcutta, 1967 (Vol. I—Text, and Vol. II—Translation). Translation, Vol. I (Chapters I-XXVII, 1951), and Vol. II (Chapters XXVIII-XXXVI, 1961) and Text, Vol. II (Chapters XXVIII-XXXVI, 1956) were published sometime ago by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. In the introduction to the recently published volumes, Ghosh modifies his earlier views and assigns the *Nāṭyaśāstra* to c. 400 to 500 B.C. or the fifth century B.C.³⁰ The extant recensions

25. Smith, *EHI*, 1924, pp. 237f.; Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, 1938, pp. 320, 358.

26. Some scholars place him about 95 B.C. (Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 242). We have assigned the reign of Maues to 20 B.C. to 22 A.D. (*The Age of Imperial Unity*, ed. Majumdar, p. 125).

27. See R.C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Vol. I, pp. 56ff.; also Sircar, *Cosm. Geog. E. Ind. Lit.*, p. 68.

28. Cf. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

29. *Op. cit.*, p. 52. Kieth and Winternitz refer the *Nāṭyaśāstra* to a date somewhat earlier than Bhāsa and Kālidāsa (*Hist. Sans. Lit.*, p. 372; *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, Vol. III, p. 39); but that is not the work in its present form (cf. Kieth, *The Sanskrit Drama*, p. 292).

30. See Vol. I, pp. xl, lxix, lxxvi.

of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* are, however, the revised forms of an earlier work, and the present texts do not seem to be much earlier than the fifth century A.D. Ghosh admits that, as early as the 10th century A.D., the work was available in two recensions—short and long, and that 'minor changes' crept into both of them in later times,³¹ still, however, he does not agree with those who think that the *Nāṭyaśāstra* has been subjected to considerable rehandling before it assumed the present shape.

In the same context, Ghosh assigns Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* to the fifth century B.C.,³² the *Manusmṛiti* to a date not later than 500 B.C.,³³ Bhāsa's plays to a date between 450 and 350 B.C.,³⁴ and Pāṇini to c. 600 B.C.³⁵ In all such cases, Ghosh adduces his reasons which, however, may not satisfy his readers. Thus, if Pāṇini mentions *yavanāni* in the sense of 'the Yavana or Greek alphabet',³⁶ it is difficult to place him before the foundation of the Achaemenian dynasty of Iran in the middle of the sixth century B.C., because the name *Yavana* is derived from *Yauna* used for the first time in the Achaemenian records to mean the Greek settlers of Ionia in Asia Minor. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* (XXIII. 103) also mentions the Yavanas or Greeks along with other foreigners such as the Śakas, Pahlavas and Vāhlikas, and this fact seems to indicate a date in the early centuries of the Christian era.³⁷ Again, Ghosh draws our attention to the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (I. 10-11) mentioning the Lokapālas headed by Mahendra (Indra) and to the *Manusmṛiti* (VII. 4) giving a list of eight Lokapālas as Indra, Anila (Wind), Yama, Arka (Sun), Agni, Varuṇa, Candra and Vitteśa (Kubera) and argues that, as seven of the said eight gods are Vedic deities, the *Manusmṛiti* may be placed at the close of the Vedic age.³⁸ It may, however, be pointed out that the original conception was only of four Lokapālas or Dikpālas, viz. Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera and Vāsava or Indra respectively in the south, west, north and east (cf. the Buddhist conception of Virūḍhaka, Virūpākṣa, Vaiśravaṇa or Kubera, and Dhṛtarāṣṭra), while the other four deities, associated with the north-east, north-west, south-east and south-west were added to the list about the Gupta age.³⁹ Again, what Manu (II. 34-32) says about the name-endings of persons belonging to the different *Varnas* is not very much earlier than the age of the Guptas.⁴⁰

The present *Nāṭyaśāstra* mentions Nepāla (XIV 43) and Mahārāṣṭra (XIV. 38) which do not point to a date definitely earlier than the Gupta period. Nepāla, which

31. *Ibid.*, p. xxix.

32. *Ibid.*, p. lxx. The mention of Mahārāṣṭra (VI. 4. 11 ; 5. 29) in the present text of the *Kāmasūtra* suggests a much later date. This geographical name is mentioned for the first time in the *Mahāvamśa* (ed. Geiger, Ch. XII, p. 97) assigned to the close of the 5th century A.D. (Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, Vol. II, p. 211). The earliest epigraphic mention is found in the Aihole inscription of 634-35 A.D. Hiuen-tsang also mentions it. Winternitz refers the *Kāmasūtra* to the fourth century (*ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 624) and Kieth to c. 500 A.D. (*Hist. Sans. Lit.*, p. 469).

33. *Op. cit.*, p. lxxviii, note.

34. *Ibid.*, p. lxxxii.

35. *Ibid.*, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

36. See Kātyāyana's *Vārttika* and Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini, IV. 1. 49.

37. Here the Vāhlikas may be the Kuṣāṇas who are often associated with Bactria (Vāhlika) ; cf. Bardesanes (latter half of the 2nd century A.D.) speaking of the Bactrians as the Qusani (Kuṣāṇa). See Sircar, *Some Problems of Kuṣāṇa and Rājput History*, pp. 45-46.

38. *Op. cit.*, p. lxxviii, note 213.

39. See Sircar, *Studies in the Religious Life of Ancient and Medieval India*, pp. 238ff.

40. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 422-23. See also above, pp. 20, note 23.

is found in no early work, is for the first time mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription⁴¹ of Samudragupta. (c. 335-76 A.D.) as we have seen. Mahārāṣṭra is likewise mentioned for the first time in the *Mahāvamśa* (end of the fifth century A.D.)⁴² and then in the Aihole inscription⁴³ (634-35 A.D.) of Pulakeśin II as also has been mentioned above. It is also known from Hiuen-tsang, a contemporary of Pulakeśin II.⁴⁴ But Mahārāṣṭra is conspicuous by its absence in the lists of countries found in earlier inscriptions, viz., those of the Śātavāhanas and their successors. It is no doubt mentioned in Vatsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (VI. 29) as we have said above; but this work, on this very ground, may be placed about the fifth century A.D.

Prāgjyotiṣa is mentioned in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (XIV. 45-46) as a Prācya country, i. e. a territory of the Eastern Division of India. This must have been borrowed from the geographical sections of the Purāṇas, which may be assigned to the Gupta age.⁴⁵ Originally, Prāgjyotiṣa was included in the countries of Udīcya or Uttarāpatha, i. e. North-West including the Himalayan territory in the North, and this old tradition has been followed by the *Mahābhārata* and Kālidāsa.⁴⁶

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* (III. 9) mentions a god who has been identified by Ghosh with Gaṇeśa.⁴⁷ According to Hopkins,⁴⁸ however, "the epic (i. e., *Mahābhārata*) comes before Gaṇeśa is invented. Only the late introduction (I. 1. 74 f.) acknowledges Gaṇeśa... Even the introduction has not stereotyped his name which appears as Gaṇeśāna as well as Gaṇeśa." If the date of the *Mahābhārata* be '400 B.C. - 400 A.D.' or 'circa 4th century B.C. to 4th century A.D.',⁴⁹ the introduction of Gaṇeśa in the Brāhmaṇical pantheon is to be assigned to a date not much earlier than the end of the fourth century A.D. The present text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, therefore, can hardly be placed much earlier than the fifth century.

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* section (in both recensions) dealing with metres is partly earlier and partly later than the *Chandaḥsūtra* of Piṅgala. The original *Nāṭyaśāstra* therefore may be earlier than the original *Chandaḥsūtra*, the date of which is discussed elsewhere.

41. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 2nd ed., 1965, pp. 262ff.

42. Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, Vol. II, p. 211.

43. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, pp. 1 ff.

44. Cf. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, pp. 239 ff.

45. Cf. Sircar, *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, pp. 18-19.

46. See Sircar, *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, p. 77. Among later authors, Kalhaṇa of Kashmir in Uttarāpatha follows the old tradition (cf. *Rājatarāṅginī*, IV. 171), though Rājasekhara of Madhyadeśa places Prāgjyotiṣa in the east (*Kāvya-mīmāṃsā*, G. O. S., p. 93). See Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 65, 103.

47. See *Journ. Dep. Let.*, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

48. *Epic Mythology*, pp. 206-07. The extant images of Gaṇeśa are not earlier than the fifth century A.D., though the terracotta figure of an elephant-headed female deity has been assigned to a date about the beginning of the Christian era. This seems to suggest that the elephant-headed deities were worshipped originally by the Nāgarian peoples and that they were accepted in the Brāhmaṇical pantheon at later dates. See Sircar, *Studies in the Religious Life of Ancient and Medieval India*, p. 114; also 'Ardhanārī-Gaṇapati' in *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. IV, pp. 181ff.

49. Hopkins *op. cit.*, p. 1; Winternitz, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 465.

CHAPTER III

Introduction of Classical Sanskrit in
Epigraphic Records

I

One of the most favourite theories with the nineteenth century Sanskritists of the West was that the golden age of Classical Sanskrit literature was the sixth century A.D., when flourished king Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī and his 'nine gems' including Kalidāsa.¹ This sixth century Vikramāditya was found in king Yaśodharman of the Mandasor inscriptions. The unsoundness of the theory was afterwards shown by scholars like Lassen and Bühler. Bühler examined a number of inscriptions including the Nasik Prakrit record (c. 150 A.D.) of Gautamī Balaśrī, the Junagadh Sanskrit record (150 A.D.) of Rudradāman, and many inscriptions of the Gupta period, and proved the flourishing state of Classical prose and poetry, both in Sanskrit and Prakrit, at the courts of Indian princes as early as the second century A.D.² It was also shown that Yaśodharman was neither a Vikramāditya, nor a Śākāri (title of the traditional Vikramāditya), nor even had he his capital at Ujjayinī, and that the so-called 'nine gems' were not known to have lived in the same age. Other theories ascribing later dates to Kalidāsa, the best Classical Sanskrit writer, were proved to be untenable by the discovery of the Aihole inscription³ of Pulakeśin II, dated Śaka 556=634-35 A.D. This record mentions the names of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi as already very famous. The introductory verses of the *Harṣacarita* also mention several authors including Kālidāsa, who flourished before its author Bāṇa, a court poet of king Harṣavardhana (606-47 A.D.). It is now generally believed that Vikramāditya Śākāri of the legends is the Gupta king Candragupta II (c. 376-413 A.D.) and that, of the 'nine gems', at least Kālidāsa lived in the 4th-5th century A.D.

Now, however, we have to look at the question from a different point of view. We have noticed attempts to ascribe the thirteen Trivandrum plays to the time of Candragupta Maurya, i.e., to the 4th century B.C., and the authorship of the *Mṛcchakatika* to Simuka, founder of the Śātavahana family, who should probably be

1. See Max Müller, *India, what can it teach us?* pp. 281 ff.

2. *Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie*, translated in *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XLII, 1913; translation reprinted in *JAIH*, Vols. II (pp. 188ff.) and III (pp. 193 ff.); also issued separately. Cf. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. II, pp. 1159 f., 1169 f.

3. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, pp. 1ff.

assigned to the middle of the first century B.C. We have to see if there is evidence of the existence of a developed *kāvya* style and of the popularity of Classical metres and of *Samskṛta* (or the refined, reformed speech) at the courts of Indian kings in the centuries before Christ.

The first question relates to the development and popularisation of Classical Sanskrit. It evidently owes its development to the endeavours of early grammarians like Śakāṭayana, Śakalya, Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, Patañjali, Śarvavarman and others. The most important and the earliest extant Classical Sanskrit grammar is that of Pāṇini who, however, seems to have been preceded by a number of writers on the subject. Pāṇini's date is disputed, though he is now often placed in the 5th century B.C. It is often believed that *Samskṛta* is the refined form of the popular speech of Madhyadeśa which originally signified the upper valleys of the Ganges and the Jamuna. But Pāṇini is traditionally connected with Śālatūra in Gandhāra in the north-western part of the Indian sub-continent. Kātyāyana is placed between Pāṇini and Patañjali who again is taken to be a contemporary of the Śuṅga king Puṣyamitra (c. 185-50 B.C.) on the strength of the *Mahābhāṣya* passages like *iha Puṣyamitraṁ yājayāmaḥ*. But there is reason to believe that the text of the work, as we have it now, contains later interpolations, so that everything contained in the *Mahābhāṣya* may not be as old as the second century B.C. The present text of Patañjali's work, as we have seen above, should possibly be placed about the second century A.D.⁴ According to tradition, Patañjali was a native of Gonarda which was situated between Ujjayinī and Vidiśā (Besnagar). Śarvavarman lived at the court of a Śālivāhana or Śatavāhana king, possibly of Pratiṣṭhāna (Paithan in the Aurangabad District, Maharashtra), and appears to have lived considerably before the beginning of the 3rd century A.D. when the Śatavāhana power collapsed. It must be noticed here that, according to scholars, Sanskrit was not a spoken language at the time of Pāṇini and that, even among the cultured classes, it was not in colloquial usage, but was confined to the grammatical schools.⁵

Now, in spite of the efforts of grammarians, it is clear from the evidence of epigraphy that Sanskrit was not popular at the Indian courts as late as the 1st and 2nd centuries A. D. Almost all records, whether of kings or of private persons, belonging to a period prior to the first century A. D. are written in Prakrit. In Western India, and some areas of Northern India, Prakrit began to be gradually ousted by Sanskrit from the field of epigraphy between the 1st century B. C. and the 2nd century A. D. though in Southern India it lingered on upto the middle of the 4th century A. D. Inscriptions also suggest that the ousting of Prakrit by Sanskrit was possibly first at work in the western and north-western regions of India, including the land of Pāṇini, whence the tendency may have spread eastwards and southwards. The inscriptional Prakrit generally avoids the use of conjuncts; but they are in general use in those Prakrit records which are linguistically and chronologically nearer the Sanskrit records. It is interesting to note that the Girnar (Junagadh District, Gujarat), Shahbazgarhi (Peshawar District, Pakistan) and Mansehra (Hazara District, Pakistan) versions of Aśoka's Rock Edicts—especially the last two—

4. See above, pp. 17ff. Cf. a tradition recorded in Kalhaṇa's *Rajataranginī*, I. 163, 174, 176. The study of the *Mahābhāṣya*, which was 'rare', became reorganised at the time of king Abhimanyu (I. 176) who ruled after Huṣka (Huviṣka), Juṣka (Vajheṣka, Vāsiṣka) and Kaṇiṣka (II).

5. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. IV, p. 281.

exhibit a tendency to use conjuncts. The language of these versions is nearer Sanskrit in comparison with that of the other versions of Aśoka's Rock Edicts. In place of the passage *Devānāmpiyasa Piyadasine lājine* of the Kalsi, Dhauli and Jaugada versions, we have *Devanāmpriyasa Priyadasino raño* (Girnar), *Devanapriasa Priadraśisa raño* (Shahbazgarhi) and *Devanapriyasa Priydraśine rajine* (Mansehra), and in place of *mige no dhuve*, we have *mrugo no dhruvaṃ* (Shahbazgarhi) and *mrige no dhruvaṃ* (Mansehra).⁶ And it is interesting that Sanskrit was first used in the records of kings who ruled in the country between Kathiawar in the south and Ayodhya in the east.⁷ It was popularised in Western India by foreigners like the Scythians who came into possession of North-Western India, the land of Pāṇini. Inscriptions like those of the Scythian chiefs, which are written in mixed Sanskrit and Prakrit, prove to be a landmark in the popularisation of Sanskrit in Northern India. These facts possibly go to show that, unless we have proofs of a positive character, no Classical Sanskrit *kāvya*—especially *drśya kāvya* which is meant for the enjoyment of the public—can be safely given a date considerably before the birth of Christ.

Now we may take up the question of the development of Classical poetry. Not to speak of a developed *kāvya* style, even figurative expressions and long compounds (*ojo-guṇa*, i.e. *samāsa-bhūyastva*, which is the very life of Classical prose) are conspicuous by their absence in early epigraphic records. Of the early records, the Nanaghat Prakrit inscription of Nāgannikā (close of the 1st century B. C.), which is a *praśasti* of her dead husband, gives rare instances of figurative expression in the passages like *sāgara-girivara-valayāya paṭhaviya paṭhama-vīrasa*, though the contemporary record, known as the Hāthigumphā inscription of Kharavela, is written in full *kāvya* style.⁸ Thus the development of *kāvya* style in Prakrit may be assigned to the period before the beginning of the Christian era. However, epigraphy does not suggest the existence of a developed *kāvya* literature in Sanskrit in the pre-Christian centuries.

A consideration of the question of the development and popularity of Classical metres also tells a similar story. Classical metres like *Malatī*, *Pramitakṣarā*, *Paharṣiṇī* and *Vasantatilakā* are no doubt found in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. But, as we have already seen, it is not certain that everything in the work belongs to the age of Patañjali who lived in the 2nd century B. C. The Junagadh record of Rudradāman appears to refer to the king's efficiency in composing *gadya* and *padya kāvya*s. In inscriptions, Classical metres are seen to be first used in the records of the Mathurā Śakas of about the beginning of the first century A. D.⁹ These facts appear to prove that such metres were at least not quite popular before the birth of Christ.

6. The Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra versions are written in the Kharoṣṭhi script which does not use long ā, etc.

7. The Ayodhya Sanskrit record (*Select Inscriptions*, 1965, p. 95) of Dhana[deva], with constant use of serif and angular forms of letters like *pa*, *ma*, *sa*, etc., cannot be earlier than the close of the 1st century B.C. The Sanskrit inscription (*ibid.*, pp. 90-91) of Sarvatrāta, from Ghosundi-Hathibada (Chitorgadh District, Rajasthan), may be assigned to the first half of the same century. Cf. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 39 ff.

8. For the Nanaghat and Hāthigumphā inscriptions, see Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, *op. cit.*, pp. 193ff., 214ff.

9. See *Select Inscriptions*, *op. cit.*, p. 122 (*Bhujāṅgaviṣṇubhīta*); *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 200, No. 7. Cf. also the Sanchi inscription of 279 A.D. in *Sel. Ins.*, p. 187 (*Sardulavikrīḍita*).

The above facts may suggest that Sanskrit works in a developed *kāvya* style may not be much earlier than the 1st century A. D.; but the Hathigumpha inscription (close of the 1st century B.C.) of Kharavela, written in Prakrit in a developed *kāvya* style, pushes the beginning of *kāvya* style to a still earlier date as we have seen. The date of the drama or *drśya-kāvya* can be considered from another point of view. The determining factor in this case may be the language and style of the Prakrit inscriptions, which may be compared with the language and style of the Prakrit portions of a drama. Like royal edicts, dramas were no doubt meant to be intelligible to the public. At least the Prakrits used in dramas are theoretically in imitation of popular speech even though the language may have been retouched by later copyists. A comparison of the Prakrit portions (with their *ojo-guṇa*) of the extant Sanskrit dramas with the Prakrit records shows that none of the latter can be earlier than the 1st century B. C., because *samāsa-bhūyastva* was almost unknown in Indian epigraphy before the Hathigumpha inscription of the close of the 1st century B. C. Any attempt at identifying the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* with the founder of the Śātavāhana family would appear improbable, if only we compare the Prakrit portions of this drama with the language of the early Śātavāhana inscriptions. We have also to note in this connection the traditions regarding the ignorance of Sanskrit ascribed to the Śātavāhana patron of Śārvavarman, who could not distinguish between *m=odaka* ('no water') and *modaka* (sweets), the Śātavāhana of Kuntala who, according to the *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā*, ordered exclusive use of Prakrit in his harem, and the Śātavāhana king Hala credited with the authorship of the *Gāthāsaptasatī*. The above facts together with the evidence of the inscriptions of the family, which are all written in Prakrit, appear to prove that the Śātavāhanas of the Deccan may not have been great patrons of Sanskrit literature. At least, in these circumstances, a theory ascribing the authorship of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* to Simuka may be regarded as unsatisfactory, unless, of course, it is supported by evidence of a very definite character.¹⁰

Similarly, a comparison of the style of the thirteen Trivandrum plays¹¹ with that of the inscriptions of Aśoka proves the dubious nature of the theory assigning the plays to the 4th century B.C.¹² The theory, however, is based on a supposed similarity between some passages of the plays and those of the *Arthaśāstra* ascribed to Kauṭilya who is said to have lived in the 4th century B.C. at the court of Candra-

10. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* (Act IX), which represents the judge (*Adhikaranika*) in a court of law as accompanied by the *Śreṣṭhin* and *Kāyastha*, can hardly be a pre-Gupta work. The earliest mention of *śreṣṭhin* and *kāyastha* as officials and semi-officials has been traced in the records of the Gupta period (Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 4th ed., p. 473, note). The designation *Kāyastha* probably occurs for the first time in a record of the Kuṣāṇa age, dated 171 A.D. (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 152).

11. Whatever be the date of Bhāsa, the Trivandrum plays may be placed in the Gupta period on the strength of the celebrated verse:

*imāṃ sāgara-paryantāṃ Himavad-Vindhya-kunḍalāṃ/
mahīm=ek-ātapatr-āṅkāṃ Rājasīmhaḥ praśastu naḥ*||

The verse appears to refer to a king of Northern India whose kingdom lay between the Himalayas and the Vindhyas, and between the Arabian Sea and the Bay of Bengal. Raychaudhuri may be right in identifying this Rājasīmha with Candragupta II (*op. cit.*, p. 442, note). If Bhāsa was the author of these plays, he was possibly an older contemporary of Kālidāsa.

12. Cf., e.g., the *ojo-guṇa* and the artificial style in the following passages of the *Svapnavāsavadatta*, put in the mouth of a maid servant: *iyāṃ bhaṭṭi-dāriṇī ukharida-kannacūliṇa vūṃsa-sañjāda-sedabindu-viṭṭideṇa parissanta-ramaṇa-daṃsaṇeṇa muheṇa* (Act II); *nihāra-paḍihada-candalehā via* (Act III); etc.

gupta Maurya.¹³ But whatever be the age of Kauṭilya, the present-day *Arthaśāstra* has later additions in it. The *Arthaśāstra* (II, 6), as we have indicated above, refers to the system of specifying dates in terms of *rāja-varṣa* (regnal year), *māsa* (month), *pakṣa* (bright or dark fortnight) and *divasa* (day),¹⁴ and inscriptions prove that this system was becoming popular only in the 2nd century A.D. The system of dating known to Aśoka in the third century B.C. is found in such passages of his Edicts as—*dbādasa-vas-ābhisitena mayā idam āñapitaḥ*; while the Besnagar pillar inscription of the close of the 2nd century B.C. is dated as—*Bhāgabhadrasa trātārāsa vasena catuda-seṣṇa rājena vadhamānasa*.¹⁵ This system simply refers to the regnal year. A little later system refers to the regnal year, *pakṣa* of the season (originally three, but later four in a year), and day, the system lingering longer in South India. Cf. *Āśvaghoṣasya catariṣe savachare hemata-pakhe prathamē divase dasame*; *siri-Virapurisadatasa saṁvachara 20 vāsā-pakham 8¹⁶ divasam 10*; *savvaccharam paḍamam sarada-pakkham bitiyam divasam paḍamam nakkhattam Rohiniyam*.¹⁷ Mention of the month in a date is found in the foreigners' records. The system popular in North-Western India at the time of the Kuṣāṇas was to refer to months of the Yavana or Indian Calendars, and to days without reference to *pakṣa*; e.g. *Kaṇiṣkasya saṁvatsare ekaḍaṣe sam 11 Daisinkasya masasya divaseṁ athaviṣe 28*; *sam 11 Aṣaḍasa masasa di 20 Utara-phagune*; *sam 18 Kartiyasa masa divase 20*; etc.¹⁸ It is interesting to note that dates of records belonging to the Kuṣāṇa period and found in the Mathurā region show a compromise between the Indian custom of referring to season and *pakṣa* and the Yavana custom of referring to month; e.g. *sam 5 he 4 di 20*.¹⁹ The reference to the 20th day proves that *he 4* signifies the 4th month of *hemanta* and not its 4th *pakṣa*. Compare also *Kaṇiṣkasya rājya-saṁvatsare navame 9 vāsā-māse pratha 1 divase 5*; *saṁvatsare pacaviṣe hemanta-mase tritiye divase viṣe*, etc.²⁰ The system which possibly owed its origin to the Yavana custom appears to have been followed about the 2nd century A.D. by another system of dating which referred both to the *māsa* and *pakṣa*; e.g. ; *vase 41 Kātika-sudhe panarasa*²¹ or *Rudradāmno varṣe dvīsaptatitame 72 Mārga-śīrṣa-bahula-pratipadi*,²² etc. It should be noted that, like Sanskrit, this system of dating seems also to have been popularised by foreigners who came through North-Western India (now in Pakistan) and that Kauṭilya, like Pāṇini, is traditionally connected with a place (Taxila) in the north-western part of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. As we have seen, Kauṭilya may have been the teacher of an *Arthaśāstra* school and the

13. The stanza

*Navam śarāvaṁ salilaiḥ supūrnāṁ susaṁskṛtāṁ darbhā-kṛt-ottarīyam/
tat = tasya mā bhūn = narakam sa gacched = yo bhartṛ-piṇḍasya kṛte na yudhyet//*

occurs both in Bhāsa's *Pratijñāyugandharāyaṇa* (IV. 2) and the *Arthaśāstra* (X. 3).

14. See above, p. 20, note; also *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IV, pp. 441-42.

15. *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., pp. 18, 89.

16. The number of the fortnight shows that the year was divided into three seasons (*grīṣma*, *varṣā* and *hemanta*) of eight *pakṣas* each. *Sarat* was afterwards added to the list of seasons. See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 235 ff.

17. Lüders' List, Nos. 922, 1202, 1196.

18. *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., pp. 139, 141, 142. Dates like 'the 14th day of Kārttika' are also mentioned in the Bajaur inscription (*ibid.*, pp. 103 ff.) of an earlier date.

19. Lüders' List, No. 20.

20. *Ibid.*, Nos. 22, 32.

21. *Ibid.*, No. 1133.

22. *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., p. 176.

author of the original *Arthaśāstra*, which may have been composed in the 4th century B.C. ; but some portions of the work and its form, as we have it to-day, are probably not much earlier than the 2nd century A.D.

The earliest known writer of Classical *kāvya* (including *dṛśya-kāvya*) is Aśvaghōṣa who, curiously enough, is traditionally known to have lived at the court of the Kuṣāṇa king Kaṇiṣka at Puruṣapura (Peshawar), though he is said to have been originally living at the Pāṭaliputra court. He is thus not only connected with North-Western India, associated with the development of Sanskrit, but also with the foreigners who favoured Sanskrit. Aśvaghōṣa's date is determined by that of Kaṇiṣka who is supposed to have ruled about the last quarter of the first century A. D. There is no proof that Classical Sanskrit *kāvyas* were popular in other parts of India in the age of Aśvaghōṣa.²³ It seems, however, that his was not the first attempt to write Classical *kāvyas*, and that, in North-Western India, there may have existed some works in Classical Sanskrit even before his time. Though the history of the beginning of Classical literature is obscure, it may thus be conjecturally placed about a century earlier than the time of Aśvaghōṣa. Theatrical performances, however, seem to have existed long before our first known dramatist's time; but they were probably like the 18th-19th century Bengali *yātrā* (half-written and half-unwritten plays) and the Bengali *bhasān yātrā* and *gājir gan* (unwritten plays) of the present day. The age of Sanskrit dramas seems to have been preceded by centuries of unwritten plays, and possibly also an age of popular, unartificial Prakrit dramas which are now lost.

II

The famous Vo-canh rock inscription was edited by Bergaigne²⁴ and commented upon by Finot.²⁵ It has been included by R. C. Majumdar in his *Campā*.²⁶ We are told that several lines at the beginning of the record are lost, that the inscription, composed in Sanskrit, may be referred, on palaeographic grounds, to the second or third century A. D., and that there are two verses in the *Vasantatilakā* metre in the record, the rest of which is in prose.²⁷

It seems, however, that palaeography has misled scholars in determining the date of the Vo-canh inscription. The language, style and metre used in the record appear to suggest that the inscription is later—at least not earlier than the fourth century A. D.

As we have seen above, most Indian records (both of kings and private persons), earlier than the first century A. D., are written in Prakrit. Sanskrit was not in general use even in the second century A. D. The said century, however, offers us a number of inscriptions written in Prakrit mixed with Sanskrit, and also a few epigraphs like the Junagadh Sanskrit record of Rudradāman (c. 130-50 A. D.) which

23. It is not possible to prove that the popular epic literature was originally written in Prakrit. However, the *Rāmāyaṇa* is believed to have been sung by bards before public gatherings ; it may therefore have been written in a language which was easily intelligible to the people. The same appears to have been the case with the *Mahābhārata*, a saga of the Kuru-Pāñcāla area.

24. *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, etc., Tome 27, Iere Partie, Fascicule No. 20, p. 191.

25. BEFEO, Vol. XV, No. 2, p. 3.

26. R. C. Majumdar, *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, Vol. I, Lahore, 1927, Book III, pp. 1ff. See also Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., pp. 503 ff.

27. Majumdar, op. cit., p. 1,

points to the beginning of Prakrit being ousted by Sanskrit in particular quarters of Western and North-Western India. Generally speaking, Sanskrit began gradually to oust Prakrit from the field of epigraphy in that part of India between the first century B. C. and the 2nd century A. D.; but the victory was not complete before the fourth century. Prakrit lost the field in South Indian epigraphy only about the latter half of the fourth century A. D. as we have seen.

The question now is : which part of India was responsible for introducing the fashion of composing records in the Indian language in Far Eastern countries like Campā? Even if we believe that the colonists belonged to the western and north-western parts of India, we must admit that the style of the Vo-canh inscription is considerably later than the diction not only of the first century inscriptions of the Mathurā Śakas, which contain a few stanzas in Classical metres, but also of the Junagadh inscription (150 A.D.) of Rudradāman. If the colonists belonged to Eastern India, the date of our record should be later, as there is no proof that Sanskrit became popular in that part of the country before the rise of the Guptas (320 A. D.). If, however, it is believed that the colonists went from near the mouths of the Kṛṣṇa and the Godavari, the Vo-canh record can hardly be earlier than the closing years of the fourth century A. D., because Prakrit was the language of inscriptions in that part of India as late as the middle of the fourth century.²⁸

Again, when were the Classical metres, like *Vasantatilakā*, extensively used in Indian epigraphs? Inscriptions prove that such metres were certainly not in general use in India before the rise of the Guptas.²⁹ The Vo-canh inscription containing at least two verses in *Vasantatilakā*, may therefore be assigned to a period later than the first half of the fourth century A. D. It may be later, but does not appear to be much earlier.

G. Coedes does not agree with the above views and has drawn our attention to the following facts:³⁰

(1) the 'box-headed' alphabet of the 5th century was diffused to the Far Eastern countries with astonishing rapidity;

(2) a Mathurā Brāhmī inscription of the time of Śoḍaśa is in Classical Sanskrit and contains a verse in the ornate metre *Bhujāṅgaviṃśbhīta*. This record together with the Junagadh inscription would mark, in Indian epigraphy, the victory of Sanskrit over Prakrit;

(3) Śrī-Māra, at whose order the Vo-canh inscription was composed,³¹ is to be identified with Fan-She-man of the Chinese annals, who was king of Fou-nan in the

28. See above, pp. 25ff.; also Sircar, *Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan*, Calcutta University, 1939, pp. 166 ff. It must be noted that the Cho Dinh Rock inscription which is palaeographically assigned to circa 400 A.D. (Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 3) refers to king Bhadravarman as *Dharma-mahārāja*. This is a typical South Indian style (Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 171, note) and seems to have been taken from the Kadamba territory. Possibly the Cho Dinh record too should be placed about the close of the fifth century.

29. For the date of Patañjali who gives examples of Classical metres in the *Mahābhāṣya*, see above, pp. 17ff.; also Sircar in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XV, pp. 633ff.

30. *IHQ*, Vol. XVI, pp. 484ff.

31. The passages, however, appear to indicate that the record belongs to one of the family of Śrīmāra who is therefore earlier than the record. The person responsible for the Vo-canh record is called an ornament of the Śrī-Mārarāja-kula and a delighter of the family of king Śrī-Māra,

end of the 2nd century A.D., and not with K'iu Lien (from 192 A.D.) as proposed by M.G. Maspero and supported by M.S. Sugimoto. In that case, the Vo-canb record cannot be later than 230 A.D.

As regards the first argument, it may be pointed out that the 'box-headed' alphabet cannot be called a 5th century script. Its great popularity during the 4th century in Central India is proved by such records as the Eran pillar inscription of Samudragupta and the Basim copper-plate grant of Vākātaka Vindhyaśakti II.³² Central Indian epigraphs of the 3rd century are rare; but the fourth century finds prove that the diffusion of the 'box-headed' script in the Far East was not so rapid as supposed by Coedes.

As to the inscription of Śaka Śodāsa who ruled in 15 A.D., we are referred to more than a century earlier than the time of Rudradāman; but this record certainly does not prove the popularity of Sanskrit or the victory of Sanskrit over Prakrit in Indian epigraphy during the 1st century A.D., as other records and coin-legends of Śodāsa himself are in Prakrit.³³ It only proves that Classical Sanskrit and the ornate metre were used on rare occasions in some parts of India during the 1st century A.D. Of course, if it can be proved that the Hindu civilization of the Far Eastern countries was due to the priestly class especially of the Mathurā region, the evidence of Śodāsa's inscription may offer an argument in favour of an early date of the Vo-canb inscription. However, the popularity in the Far Eastern countries of the 'box-headed' alphabet, the 'Śaka' era and names ending in *varman*, and the Aśvatthāman tradition in the background of the cultural history of both Campā and Kambuja speak against any such idea.

With reference to the identification of Śrī-Māra with Fan-She-man, Coedes says, "As regards *Fan*, it is well known that it is an equivalent of the termination of royal names with *varman*, interpreted by the Chinese as name of family." Coedes thus believes in the existence of a Varman dynasty (i.e. a line of kings with names ending in *varman*) in Campā in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. This, however, is not only a conjecture, but appears to go against evidence. The popularity of names ending in *varman* was rather late in India, where there was no important royal dynasty of Varmans as late as the early centuries of the Christian era. There is no noteworthy epic hero whose name ends in *varman*, and such names are rarely found in the older sections of the epics and the Purāṇas. Epigraphs of the early centuries of the Christian era do not speak of any important Varman dynasty. Names with *varman* are found popular in India from the 4th century A.D. It is interesting to note that the Smṛti injunction regarding distinctive names for the different *Varṇas* has its germ in the *Manusmṛti* (about the 3rd century A.D.), which has been expanded by the later Nibandhakāras.³⁴ The popularity of Varman names in the Far Eastern countries could have been borrowed from India, probably from South India, after the 3rd century A.D.³⁵

32. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, op. cit., pp. 268ff., 430ff.

33. Cf. Smith, *Catalogue of Coins*, pp. 195ff.

34. *IHQ*, Vol. XV, p. 636; *Suc. Sat.*, p. 228. It may be noted that Brāhmaṇical names ending in *śarman* are also not found in early inscriptions and in the older sections of the epics. Stray Brāhmaṇa names with *śarman* and Kṣatriya names with *varman* in early Indian literary and epigraphic records again would not prove either the popularity of such names or the existence of Varman dynasties.

35. For some early Varman kings of South India, see Sircar, *Suc. Sat.*, pp. 390ff.

In these circumstances, we are not convinced that the date of the Vo-canh inscription is earlier than the 4th century A.D. With reference to the palaeographical difficulty, it may be pointed out that, even in India, the Mathurā inscription³⁶ of Candragupta II dated in 380 A.D., is written in the Kuṣāṇa script of about the 2nd century A.D.³⁷

36. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 1ff.

37. On the controversy regarding the date of the Vo-canh inscription, Emile Gaspardone (*Journ. As.*, Tome CCXLI, 1953, pp. 477ff.) argued in favour of the late date (about the 5th century A.D.), while K.K. Sarkar (*Sino-Indian Studies*, Vol. V, No. 2, 1956, pp. 77ff.) supported Coedes. See also K. Bhattacharya in *AA*, Vol. XXIV, 1961, pp. 219ff., and Gaspardone again in *Sinologica*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, 1965, pp. 129ff.

CHAPTER IV

Traditions about the Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies

I

A careful examination of the evidence relating to the Bhārata War reveals two interesting facts. In the first place, even in ancient India, people were not sure as to when exactly the event might have occurred. Secondly, reference to it is conspicuous by its absence in the Vedic literature, *i.e.* in the earliest works of Indian literature, even though Kurukṣetra and the Kuru-Pañcālas are often mentioned therein. The importance of these points does not appear to be generally realised by the writers on the subject.

It seems that, when the popularity of the story of the Bhārata War developed considerably, an eagerness was exhibited by some people to assign a date to this so-called great event, and this led to the growth of a diversity of traditions which may be enumerated as follows.

1. According to Āryabhaṭa of Kusumapura (Pāṭaliputra), who was born in 476 A.D. and composed his celebrated astronomical treatise in 499 A.D., the Kali-yuga started in 3102 B. C.¹ The same view was supported by the author of the Aihole inscription (634-35 A. D.), who states that 3735 years elapsed since the Bhārata War in the expired Śaka year 556.² Numerous later writers have followed this tradition, so that the beginning of the Kali-yuga era in 3102 B.C. came to be more or less generally accepted ultimately. But the division of time into four Yugas (*viz.* Kṛta, Tretā, Dvāpara and Kali) is not met with in very early Indian literature, and J.F. Fleet adduced reasons to believe that the reckoning was unknown in Vedic times and that it was invented by the astronomers and chronologists 3500 years after the initial point assigned to it, *i. e.* about the commencement of the fifth century A.D.³ In addition to Fleet's suggestion, which has been accepted by most writers on early Indian history and chronology, we have tried to prove that the use of an era in the dating of records was introduced and popularised in India by the foreign rulers not much earlier than the beginning of the

1. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 22, 233; Keith, *Hist. Sans. Lit.*, p. 521.

2. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, pp. 1ff.

3. *JRAS*, 1911, pp. 479ff., 675ff.

Christian era.⁴ We have shown that all the early documents of Indian rulers, who flourished before the advent of the Scythians in the first century B.C. as well as of many later rulers of indigenous origin are dated in the regnal reckoning of the reigning monarchs and not in any era.

2. A second school of astronomers and chronologists, represented by Vṛddha Garga, Varahamihira (sixth century A.D.) and Kalhaṇa (twelfth century A.D.) placed the Kuru and Pāṇḍava heroes of the Bhārata War 653 years after the beginning of the Kali-yuga in 3102 B.C. and 2526 years before the commencement of the Śaka era in 78 A.D., i. e., in 2449 B.C.⁵ It is of course impossible to reconcile this tradition with the one discussed above. But it is based on the Purāṇic belief, to be mentioned below, that the Great Bear was in the Maghā constellation when Parikṣit was ruling and that it crosses the 27 *nakṣatras* in 27 centuries.

3. There are two Purāṇic traditions bearing on the problem under study, the first of them found in the *Vāyu*, *Matsya*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Bhāgavata* and *Viṣṇu Purāṇas* quoting the length of the intervening period from the birth of Parikṣit to the coronation of Mahāpadma Nanda.⁶ Since Parikṣit was born, according to the *Mahābhārata*, shortly after the Bhārata War and the Nanda dynasty founded by Mahāpadma ruled for a century, according to the Purāṇas, before it was extirpated by Candragupta Maurya shortly after Alexander's departure from India in 324 B.C., it is as good as the two traditions discussed above. Unfortunately, the passage giving the duration of the period is often variously read in the different Purāṇas and in the different manuscripts of the same Purāṇa as 1050, 1500, etc.⁷ That this divergence is due to the fact that the lengths of the reign periods of individual rulers flourishing between Parikṣit and Mahāpadma were read and calculated differently by the Purāṇic chroniclers and copyists is very clear from the similar case of the duration of Andhra (Śatavāhana) rule variously given often in the different Purāṇas and different manuscripts of the same Purāṇas. It is well known that this period is quoted as 300, 411, 412, 418, 456 and 460 years⁸ exactly as in the other case. The value that can be attached to such divergent traditions is not as to which of the different readings is correct, because it is apparently impossible to settle that question with the material at our disposal. The only point is that the Purāṇic chroniclers and copyists regarded the duration of the period intervening between Parikṣit's birth and Mahāpadma Nanda's coronation to have been something between 1015 and 1500 years so that this tradition would assign the Bhārata War, immediately preceding the birth of Parikṣit, to a date roughly between 1400 and 1950 B. C. Needless to say that this cannot be reconciled with the other traditions ascribing the Bhārata War to 3102 or 2449 B.C. The value

4. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 235ff.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 318-19.

6. Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 58.

7. Cf. *evaṁ varṣa-sahasraṁ tu jñeyam pañcāśad-uttaram*, the word *jñeyam* being read in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* as *śatam* (with *pañcadaś-ottaram*), and *pañcāśad-uttaram* is sometimes read as *pañca-śat-ottaram* and *pañcadaś-ottaram*. The Purāṇas also quote variously the duration of the reigns of 22 Bārhadrathas, 5 Pradyotas and 10 Śaiśunāgas, flourishing in Magadha between the Bhārata War and the rise of the Nandas, as 1408 (940+138+330), 1498 (1000+138+360) and 938 (723+52+163) years. See Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 197.

8. *The Purāṇa Text* pp. 43, 46. Cf. *varṣa-śatāni syuḥ=catvāri śaṣṭir=eva, śatāni catvāri pañca śaḍ=vai, dvādaś-adhikam.....śata-catustayam, śatāni catvāri pañcāśat śaḥ, śatāni catvāri pañca śaḥ sapta, catvāry=abda-śatāni śaṭpañcāśad-adhikāni, śate dve ca śatāni ca, etc.*

of this tradition depends on the importance we attach to the Purāṇic genealogies which are, by their very nature, certainly of little help in determining the exact date of any event of the past, although they appear to place Parikṣit centuries later than 3102 and 2449 B.C.

The unreliability of such Purāṇic traditions is illustrated by another statement found in the same context, according to which the intervening period between Mahāpadma Nanda and Puloman, who was the last of the Andhra (Śātavāhana) kings according to the Purāṇas, was 836 years (826 years according to a few manuscripts⁹). We know, however, that Mahāpadma ascended the throne shortly before 400 B. C. and the last king of the Śātavāhana dynasty ruled in the first half of the third century A. D., so that the interval between the two must have been less than 650 years.

4. Another Purāṇic tradition states that the Great Bear was in the Puṣyā constellation when Pratīpa (father of Śāntanu and great-grandfather of Parikṣit's great-grandfather) was ruling, that it took a century in crossing one *nakṣatra* and that it was in the Maghā when Parikṣit was on the throne; it is further said, in the same context, that, after the end of the Andhra (Śātavāhana) rule, the Great Bear began its cycle again after the period of 2700 years (*i. e.* was in the Puṣyā) and also that it was in the 24th constellation from Maghā after the end of the Andhras (Śātavāhanas).¹⁰ If Pratīpa flourished in the first (Puṣyā) of the 27 centuries and Parikṣit in the third (Maghā) and if the downfall of the Andhras (Śātavāhanas) fell in or shortly before the 25th or 24th century after Parikṣit, the interval between Parikṣit and Puloman would be about 23 or 22 centuries. Since Puloman flourished in the first half of the third century A. D., Parikṣit and the Bhārata War appear to be referred here to about the 20th or 19th century B.C., even though the intention was probably to assign Parikṣit to about 2449 B.C., *i. e.* in the 25th-24th century B.C. when the Great Bear was staying in the Maghā according to Varāhamihira and others. If Parikṣit is said to have flourished about 2449 B. C. and the fall of the Andhras is placed before the 25th century thereafter, *i. e.* before c. 51 A. D., this tradition also goes against the known facts of history.¹¹

5. There are certain palpably absurd traditions like those in the *Kathāsarit-sāgara* (11th century A.D.) and the Eastern Cālukya inscriptions, according to which Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī and a contemporary of the Buddha who died about 486 B.C., was the fifth or sixth in lineal succession from Parikṣit, so that the latter could not have flourished much earlier than 700 B.C.¹²

6. The Jain tradition makes the heroes of the Bhārata War contemporaries of the Tīrthāṅkara Ariṣṭanemi who, however, belongs to the domain of mythology. The chronological traditions of the Jains, which are late, conflicting and worthless for

9. *Ibid.*, p. 58.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

11. The recently published Hisse-Borala inscription (*En. Ind.*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 6) gives the date Śaka 380 (458 A.D.) as when the Great Bear was in the Uttara-Phalgunī *nakṣatra* and 3020 years of the Saptarṣi cycle elapsed, in the style of Varāhamihira and others, who speak of the Great Bear staying in Maghā 2526 years before the beginning of the Śaka era, *i. e.*, in 2449 B.C. If the Great Bear had been in Maghā in 2449 B.C. it was in Uttara-Phalgunī in 458 A.D.; but the Hisse-Borala tradition puts the commencement of the cycle at 2562 B.C. This has been misunderstood by those who have so far written on the Hisse-Borala inscription. See *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. I, 1967-68, pp. 94ff.

12. Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, 1950, p. 32; Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kishkindha*, p. 13.

historical purposes in many cases for the early period, scarcely help us in determining the date of the Bhārata War. All that can be said on this basis is that the War was fought sometime before the days of Mahāvīra, i. e., about the beginning of the 6th century or earlier.

The divergent traditions, discussed above, would show that the people had originally little knowledge about the Bhārata War, but that they entertained various ideas about its date only after its story had attained considerable popularity with the evolution of the *Mahābhārata* as an epic. If, therefore, the story developed on the basis of a genuine historical event, the latter must have been originally a petty family or tribal feud which formed the theme of a battle-song that was gradually embellished and magnified throughout the centuries by different poets and minstrels, ultimately developing into the great war-poem of the *Mahābhārata*, supposed to have been completed during the long period between the 4th century B. C. and the 4th century A. D.

Another question requiring an answer is whether the occurrence of the Bhārata War in the 4th, 3rd or 2nd millennium B. C. is reconcilable with the usually accepted views regarding the proto-historic Harappa or Indus Valley civilization and the advent of the Aryans in India about the middle of the 2nd millennium B. C. We have probably to answer the question in the negative.

A. B. Keith rightly wonders at the naive credulity of those who believe in the historicity of the Bhārata War in spite of the absence of any mention of it in the Vedas, although H. C. Raychaudhuri did not share his opinion.¹³ It appears to us, however, that there must have been reference to the Bhārata War in Indian literary works much earlier than the fourth century B.C. if it was really a remarkable historical event of the hoary past.

Raychaudhuri draws our attention to the mention, in the later Vedic literature, of such figures associated with the Bhārata War story as Pratīpa's son Bāhlika, Vicitravīrya's son Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Devakī's son Kṛṣṇa and Yajñasena's son Śikhāṇḍin as well as to the allusion to the unfriendly feelings between the Kuru prince Bāhlika and the Śrñjayas and to the Kurus reproaching the Dālbhyas associated with the Pañcālas, the Bhārata War being sometimes represented in the Great Epic, it is said, as a trial of strength between the Kurus and the Śrñjayas or Pañcālas. He further suggests that the battle-songs describing the struggle of the Kurus and the Śrñjayas and their associates must have been current in the fifth century B.C. because a Vaiśampāyana was known to Pāṇini while the *Mahābhārat-ācārya* Vaiśampāyana is mentioned in Aśvalāyana's *Gr̥hyasūtra*. Unfortunately, these arguments are palpably too inadequate to prove that the Bhārata War was regarded by the people as an event of great magnitude much earlier than fourth century B. C. It is not possible to determine whether the original battle-song, which was the nucleus on which the Bhārata War story finally developed, was one of the *itihāsas* (legends) alluded to in the Vedic literature.

13. *Op. cit.*, p. 6. It is a significant fact that Kurukṣetra and the Kurus are very often mentioned in the later Vedic literature which is, however, totally silent about the Pāṇḍavas and the battle of Kurukṣetra.

If the so-called Bhārata War was originally a small family feud or tribal struggle gradually magnified by poets and minstrels over the centuries, it is obviously not possible to determine its date. The attempts of Pargiter who assigns the event to c. 950 B.C., of Raychaudhuri ascribing it to the ninth century B.C. and of various other writers who have suggested this or that date appear to be all unconvincing.

It is often believed that Pargiter's theory is based on Purāṇic evidence. Actually, however, he not only rejects such Purāṇic statements as the one regarding the period intervening between Parikṣit's birth and Mahāpadma's accession, but even the conflicting statements regarding the length of individual reigns as given in the Purāṇas and suggests an arbitrary period covering the reigns on the basis of an imaginary average of 18 years per reign.¹⁴ We do not understand how only a part of the Purāṇic evidence can be accepted when it militates against specific statements in the Purāṇas themselves.

We cannot also overlook the shaky nature of the evidence of averages as is very clearly demonstrated by A. S. Altekar's attempt to prove in 1939 that the Bhārata War occurred in 1400 B.C., but in 1959 that the event took place in 950 B.C. as suggested by Pargiter. In both the cases he depends on the genealogy of the Eastern Cālukyas of Veṅgī, though in 1939 he spoke of 40 kings ruling for 656 years (16½ years in average), but, twenty years later, only of 32 kings reigning for 461 years (14½ years per ruler).¹⁵

Raychaudhuri depends on the list of Brāhmanical teachers as found in the Vedic literature and rejects a number of Purāṇic statements which are opposed to the Vedic evidence. He says that Kavaṣa's son Tura, who was a priest of Parikṣit's son Janamejaya, was separated by 5 or 6 generations of teachers from Aruṇa's son Uddālaka whose disciple was Kuṣītaka's son Kahola. It is further pointed out that Aśvalāyana, author of the *Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra*, or his pupil, honours a Kahola and that this Aśvalāyana may be identified with Assalāyana of the *Majjhimanikāya*, who was a contemporary of the Buddha who died in c. 486 B.C. Thus it is found that Janamejaya's contemporary Tura was 8 or 9 priestly generations above a contemporary of the Buddha, and, taking the duration of a priestly generation to cover about 30 years as suggested by Jacobi and Rhys Davids, Raychaudhuri assigns Parikṣit to a date more than 240 or 270 years earlier, i.e. in the ninth century B.C.¹⁶ It seems that he could have as well said eighth century B.C.

Unfortunately, Raychaudhuri's theory involves a number of identifications such as that of Kuṣītaka's son Kahola with Kahola of the *Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra* and of Aśvalāyana, author of the *Gṛhyasūtra*, with Assalāyana, contemporary of the Buddha, and these may not be regarded as satisfactory by all investigators, especially because his chronology is opposed to certain specific statements of the Purāṇas. According to the Purāṇic lists, Udayana, contemporary of the Buddha, was the twentyfifth in descent from Parikṣit.¹⁷ If we do not totally discard this list, we have to face the unconvincing position that 10 generations of priests covered the same period as 25

14. *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 181ff.

15. See *Proc. IHC*, 1939, p. 54; 1959, p. 26.

16. *Op. cit.*, pp. 33ff., 50ff.

17. Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text*, etc., pp. 65-66.

generations of kings. Again, if the great Bhārata War was fought in the ninth or tenth century B. C., it is not only impossible to explain the absence of any reference to it in the Vedic literature, but also to understand why the writers of the Gupta age (*viz.*, Āryabhaṭa, Varāhamihira and the compilers of the historical sections of the Purāṇas) assigned to it such remote dates as falling in the fourth, third and second millennia B. C. Further, even if Parikṣit is believed to have flourished in the ninth century B.C., it hardly proves, it seems to us, anything definite about the date, nature and magnitude of the so-called Bhārata War which in its present form is no better than a myth without any historical value at all. The final form of the story represents the War as fought primarily between the Kurus or Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas, though it is often supposed that it was really a struggle between the Kurus and the Śrījayas or Pāñcālas. If the latter was the case, then no reliance can apparently be placed on the tradition associating the War with the birth of Parikṣit, which would appear to have been introduced into the story long after the event.

Then again, in connection with the magnitude of the Bhārata War as described in the *Mahābhārata*, we have to consider whether the connection of the rulers of the eastern and southern borders of India as active participants in the Kuru-Pāṇḍava War fought in the Eastern Punjab can be much earlier than the fourth century B.C. As for instance, king Bhagadatta of Prāgjyotiṣa or Assam is an important figure in the story of the War, although this kingdom and its rulers are conspicuous by their absence in the Vedic literature. With Pāṇini's *Aṣṭadhyāyī* exhibiting no knowledge of the people of the east and south in the 5th century B.C., it is impossible to believe that the idea of the king of Assam giving his daughter in marriage to the Kuru king and fighting in the War on the latter's side was conceived earlier than the rise of the historical empire of India, *viz.* that of the Nandas, in the fourth century B.C. Indeed, all stories of earlier *digvijaya* and empire-building described in the epics and the Purāṇas have to be regarded as belonging to the domain of mythology and folklore and not of history.¹⁸

Then again, a close fight on a single battle-field between 7 and 11 *akṣauhiṇīs* of soldiers was an impossibility not only in the ancient world, but even today, an *akṣauhiṇī* being composed of 21,870 chariots, as many elephants, 65,610 horsemen and 109,305 foot-soldiers, and involving about 40 lakhs of men. It must be regarded as a flight of fancy.

Lastly, we may refer to the argument that the Bhārata War should be regarded as a historical event because the Indians generally accept it as such. It is, however, no argument at all. A few centuries ago, the whole world believed that the sun moves around the earth; but this has been proved to be a wrong belief. Likewise, the Jain and Buddhist belief in the historical existence of the earlier Jinas and Buddhas has been regarded as an absurdity. As for instance, the first Jain Tīrthaṅkara Ādinātha or Rṣabhanātha is widely venerated by the Jains and we have works on his life and career. But he has been regarded as no more a historical personage than Indra or Śiva.

18. The idea of the empire of king Jarāsandha of Magadha looks like an echo of the Magadha empire which reached its zenith in the days of the Nandas and Mauryas. Cf. Sircar, *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, pp. 19-20, notes 71 and 79.

II

There is a good deal of discrepancy in the Purāṇic accounts of well-known royal families of the historical period. A typical illustration is offered by the Purāṇic genealogy and chronology of the Śatavāhanas,¹⁹ called Andhra in most of the Purāṇas, but Andhrabhṛtya (servants of the Andhras) in a few cases.

The *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata Purāṇas* say that there were 30 Andhra kings, but never quote so many names. The *Vāyu* mentions only 17, 18, 19 or 25 names and the *Viṣṇu* only 22, 23 or 24, while the *Brahmāṇḍa* and *Bhāgavata* give respectively 17 and 23 names. On the other hand, the *Matsya Purāṇa* says that there were 19 Andhra kings, but quotes the names of 30 rulers.²⁰

There is also discrepancy in the length of the individual reigns quoted in the Purāṇas. Taking the longer or longest period wherever there is any difference, we get 471½ years for all the Andhra kings. While the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* have two passages, one giving the duration of Andhra rule as 300 years and the other a little above 400 years, one *Matsya* manuscript quotes 412 years, though most manuscripts of this Purāṇa quote 460 years as the duration. The *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata Purāṇas* and one manuscript of the *Brahmāṇḍa* give 456 years instead.²¹

Again, according to the practically unanimous testimony of the Purāṇas, Simuka (whose name is wrongly spelt in all the Purāṇic manuscripts) established Andhra suzerainty, after having overthrown the last Kāṇva king Suśarman, 294 years (137 years of Maurya rule + 112 years of Śuṅga rule + 45 years of Kāṇva rule) after Candragupta Maurya had extirpated the Nanda dynasty shortly after Alexander's departure from India in 324 B.C. as can be gathered from the writings of early European authors, that is to say, in or shortly after 324–294=40 B.C. We also know that the Andhras (Śatavāhanas) could not have ruled as an imperial power after the foundation of the Ikṣvaku and Vākāṭaka kingdoms, respectively in the northern and southern areas of the Śatavāhana empire, in the third century A.D. The length of Andhra rule usually quoted as more than 400 years is thus palpably wrong.

All this discrepancy clearly suggests that the genealogical and chronological traditions of the Purāṇas are unreliable. Moreover, numismatic evidence has offered us the names of certain Andhra or Śatavāhana kings (e.g., Kumbha Śatakarṇi, Rudra Śatakarṇi, and Kṛṣṇa Śatakarṇi)²² not known from any of the Purāṇas.

Two other unsatisfactory features of the Purāṇic traditions may also be noticed here. In the first place, we may refer to the incredibly long reign period assigned to rulers like Mahāpadma Nanda (88 years) and the Vākāṭaka king Vindhyaśakti I (96

19. Śatavāhana and Śatakarṇi are also written Śātavāhana and Śātakarṇi. But the names appear essentially to be patronymics meaning 'the son of Śatavāhana (one having hundred vehicles)' and 'the son of Śatakarṇa (one having hundred ears, i.e. capable of receiving several reporters at a time)', respectively.

20. Rapson, *Catalogue of Coins*, pp. lxvi-lxvii; Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text*, etc., pp. 38-43.

21. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, pp. 43, 46.

22. Kumbha's coins have been discovered in the Tarhala hoard (*JNSI*, Vol. II, pp. 83ff.). Rudra Śatakarṇi and Kṛṣṇa Śatakarṇi (whose name has been read as *Karna Śatakarṇi* on some Tarhala coins) are known from the coins described in Rapson's *Catalogue of Coins*.

years).²³ It is sometimes suggested, on the basis of the reading *aṣṭāviṃśati* (for *aṣṭāṣīti*) in some manuscripts only of the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, that Mahāpadma ruled for 28 years and that the duration of his life time was 88 years. But this is certainly unwarranted, because another tradition common to the *Matsya*, *Vāyu* and *Brahmaṇḍa Purāṇas* states that the nine Nandas ruled for 100 years, i.e., Mahāpadma for 88 years and his 8 sons for 12 years.²⁴

Secondly, some of the Purāṇic traditions are clearly anachronical. Thus Bāhu and Sagara, who were distant ancestors of Daśaratha of the Ikṣvāku dynasty of Ayodhyā, are stated in a story, found in the *Harivaṃśa* and a large number of the Purāṇas, to have fought with the Yavanas, Śakas, Pahlavas, etc., who, as we know, came to India more than a millennium after the supposed date of the said monarchs of Indian mythology.²⁵

In any case, if the above is the unsatisfactory position in respect of the Andhras (Śatavāhanas) who flourished only a century before the compilation of the historical section of the Purāṇas in the first half of the fourth century A.D., a similar or worse confusion must be expected in the case of the dynasties whose periods are ascribed to the hoariest antiquity.

As regards the solar line of Kosala, the discrepancy between the evidence of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and that of the Purāṇas is well known, and the two cannot be reconciled. Thus the *Rāmāyaṇa* gives only 35 names of Ikṣvāku rulers down to Rāma, whereas the Purāṇas enumerate 63 names for the same period, and, likewise, the former makes Raghu the father of Kalmaṣapada and places Aja 12 generations below Raghu, although the latter makes Aja the son of Raghu.²⁶ It is, therefore, impossible to compile a reliable genealogy of the Ikṣvākus on the basis of such conflicting sources, and it is no wonder that similar discrepancy is noticed in the works of modern writers on the genealogy of the solar line. Thus we find 96 names from Manu to Bṛhadbala in the genealogy quoted by Pargiter,²⁷ while V. Pathak quotes only 76 names.²⁸ After Bṛhadbala, the Purāṇas mention 30 names upto Sumitra so as to make $96 + 30 = 126$ names,²⁹ though in Pathak's list Sumitra's is the 102nd name. Now, in this part of the Ikṣvāku dynasty, the Purāṇas include the following names in succession—Sañjaya, his son Śakya, his successor Śuddhodana, his son Siddhartha, his son Rāhula, his successor Prasenajit, his successor Kṣudraka, his successor Kulaka, his successor Suratha and his son Sumitra, the last king of Ayodhyā. That the mention of Śakya, Śuddhodana, Siddhartha (i.e. Gautama the Buddha) and Rāhula as kings is due to confusion is clear from Buddhist evidence which makes king Prasenajit of Kośala a contemporary of the Buddha and assigns the latter's *parinirvāṇa* to the first quarter of the fifth century B.C.³⁰ It should also be noted that Buddhist literature mentions Mahākośala and Virūdhava respectively as the father (predecessor) and son (successor) of Prasenajit and that these names are not found in the Purāṇic genealogy.

23. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

25. *JAS*, 4th Series, Vol. IV, No. 2, 1962, pp. 49ff.

26. See Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 91-92.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 144ff.

28. *History of Kosala*, pp. 84ff.

29. Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text*, etc., pp. 66-67.

30. Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, 1950, pp. 102-03, 214.

According to a Purāṇic tradition, the current *manvantara* is that of Vaivasvata Manu, of which the Kṛta or Satya (1,728,000 years), Tretā (1,296,000 years) and Dvāpara (864,000 years) Yugas as well as a portion of the Kali-yuga have already elapsed. If, therefore Vaivasvata, Manu flourished 3,888,000 years before the beginning of the Kali age, he cannot possibly be regarded as about one hundred generations in ascent from Prasenajit (c. 500 B.C.). Thus either the chronological or the genealogical tradition has to be regarded as wrong. Since no human civilization had developed anywhere on the earth about a lakh of years ago, the tradition assigning Vaivasvata Manu to the 3,889th millennium B.C. is of course a ludicrous absurdity.

The Purāṇic traditions may be compared with the untrustworthy legends of Greek and Jewish origins, which are regarded as full of 'misinterpretations and mistakes'³¹ as well as with the genealogies found in the earlier books of Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, in chronicles like the Oriya *Mādalā Pāñji* and the Bengali *Rājamālā*, in the *prāśastis* noticed in the early medieval epigraphic records of India, etc., etc.

As regards the first few books of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, Stein observes, "It seems probable that those portions of Kalhaṇa's chronicle which are most open to critical objection owe their want of historical value largely to the unsatisfactory character of the earlier works. Kalhaṇa's account of the period preceding the 6th century of our era furnishes us on the whole only with bare dynastic lists and with traditions often of a very legendary nature concerning certain individual kings. But ... these scanty records of doubtful values were all that he found in his sources... It is only too evident that each narrator omitted more and more of authentic but to him uninteresting data, while legendary incidents and popular anecdotes on the other hand received an increasingly large share of attention."³² But the evidence of the temple chronicles shows that the earliest section of the accounts was based on imagination influencing oral tradition of no value at all. Indeed, it requires greater credulity than those, who are inclined to distinguish legend and mythology from history, possess to accept as historical what the Purāṇas say about Manu (the founder of the Ikṣvāku and other houses) and his successors or what the Kashmir chronicle narrates about the earlier rulers of the land, one of whom is represented as a contemporary of the Pāṇḍava king Yudhiṣṭhira (assigned to 2449 B.C.) and another credited with an absurd reign period of 300 years.³³ The Oriya *Mādalā Pāñji*, which is of the nature of the temple chronicles of South India,³⁴ must have depended on legends current about the sixteenth century A.D. among the priests of the Jagannātha temple at Purī, supplemented largely by their own imagination, regarding three royal families that ruled over the Purī region in the near, distant and remote past, viz. (1) the Sūryavaṁśī Gajapatis (c. 1435-1541 A.D.), (2) the Gaṅgas (i.e. the later Eastern Gaṅgas, c. 1110-1435 A.D.), and (3) the Kesarīs (i.e. the later Somavaṁśīs, c. 1025-1110 A.D.). Consequently, the

31. Hall, *Anc. Hist. N. East*, 7th ed., pp. 2-3. For the close resemblance of Purāṇic genealogies with Irish annals, cf. *JAIH*, Vol. V, p. 361; see *Studia Hibernica*, Vol. III (1963), pp. 113-27.

32. *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, Vol. I, pp. 28-29.

33. *Ibid.*, I. 56ff.; III. 470. Kalhaṇa's attitude to such absurdities is clear from III. 94-95, which support his description of the miraculous activities of king Meghavāhana in the following words: "We feel embarrassed indeed in thus recording these and other acts of this king of recent times, which cannot be believed by the common people. However, authors who follow the path of the ancient sages are of course not dominated by subservience to the hearer's notions on their compositions."

34. Cf. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, *A History of South India*, p. 21.

tradition about these three dynasties is partially reliable in the first case, mostly unreliable in the second and absolutely worthless in the third.³⁵ Of the 46 rulers of the Kesarī dynasty assigned to the period between the sixth and the twelfth century A.D., the name of the dynasty and the duration of its rule being both totally wrong, the names of only three may be somehow traced in the Later Somavamśī genealogy. The absence of any reference to the rulers of the Bhauma-Kara and early dynasties (e.g., Gupta, Vighraha, Māna, Gauḍa and Śailodbhava) shows that the compilers of the *Madala Pāñji* were absolutely ignorant about the genuine events of the history of Orissa before the tenth century A.D. Faced with these circumstances, who can say that the case of the earlier names in the Purāṇic genealogies is not like that of the imaginary Kesarī kings of the *Madala Pāñji*? It may also be noticed that the earliest and most dubious names in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (i.e. Gonanda I and his successors) were accepted by Kalhaṇa on the authority of a Purāṇa called *Nilamata*. Who can be sure that our Purāṇas are better in respect of the earliest names in the genealogies than the *Nilamata Purāṇa* ascribed to a sage named Nilamuni? In this connection, reference may be made to the imaginary genealogy of the kings of Tripurā as found in the Bengali chronicle called *Rājamālā* which gives us to understand that the Mongoloid Tiprā rulers were direct descendants of the Pāṇḍava heroes of the lunar race.

Instances of fabricated genealogy are also found in numerous epigraphic records. It is well known that the epigraphs of the Calukyas of Badami represent Vikramāditya I (655-81 A.D.) as the son of Pulakeśin II (610-42 A.D.), although their genealogy fabricated less than three centuries afterwards by the Later Calukyas tells us that Pulakeśin II was succeeded regularly by his son Nedamari, grandson Ādityavarman and great-grandson Vikramāditya I.³⁶ In the records of the Eastern Gaṅga monarch Vajrahasta III (1038-70 A.D.), his predecessors are mentioned as : (1) Guṇamahārṇava (i.e. Guṇārṇava), (2) his son Vajrahasta I (44 years), (3) his son Guṇḍama (3 years), (4) his brother Kāmārṇava (35 years), (5) his brother Vinayāditya (3 years), (6) Kāmārṇava's son Vajrahasta II Aniyāṅkabhīma (35 years), (7) his son Kāmārṇava ($\frac{1}{2}$ year), (8) his brother Guṇḍama (3 years), (9) his step-brother Mādhukāmārṇava (19 years), (10) Kāmārṇava's son Vajrahasta III (1038-70 A.D.).³⁷ The same genealogy is quoted even in the earlier records of Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga (1078-1147 A.D.).³⁸ But, in the later epigraphs of Coḍagaṅga, we find the genealogy as follows : from Ananta (Viṣṇu), through the Moon, to Gaṅgeya; from Gaṅgeya to Kolāhala, founder of Kolāhalapura in Gaṅḡavādī; his son Vīrocana; then after 81 kings of Kolāhalapura, Vīrasimha; his five sons Kāmārṇava I, Dānārṇava I, Guṇārṇava I, Mārasimha and Vajrahasta I; of these (1) Kāmārṇava defeated Balāditya, conquered Kālīṅga and ruled at Jantāvūra for 36 years; (2) his brother Dānārṇava (40 years) (3) his son Kāmārṇava II (reigned at Nagara for 50 years); (4) his son Raṇārṇava (5 years); (5) his son Vajrahasta II (15 years); (6) his brother Kāmārṇava III (19 years); (7) his son Guṇārṇava II (27 years); (8) his son Jitāṅkuśa (15 years); (9) his brother's son Kaligalaṅkuśa (12 years); (10) his uncle Guṇḍama I (7 years); (11) his brother Kāmārṇava IV (25 years); (12) his brother Vinayāditya (3 years); (13) Vajrahasta IV (35 years), son of Kāmārṇava IV; (14) his son Kāmārṇava V ($\frac{1}{2}$

35. See below; also *JIH*, Vol. XXXI, 1953, pp. 233f.; *JAS*, op. cit., No. 1, p. 9.

36. See Sircar in *The Classical Age*, ed. Majumdar, p. 242.

37. Bhandarkar's *List of Inscriptions*, No. 1091.

38. *Ibid.*, No. 1100.

year); (15) his brother Cundaṇḍa II (3 years); (16) his step-brother Madhukāmaṇava (19 years); and (17) his son Vajrahasta V (1038-70 A.D.).³⁹ Leaving aside the mythical figures, we find that a host of apparently imaginary personages (such as Kolahala of Mysore and his descendants, some of whom migrated to Orissa, have been introduced in the modified genealogy between Turvasu and Guṇārṇava II (No. 7) who is the progenitor of the family in the earlier account, but is represented here as Guṇārṇava II. It will be seen that the two accounts tally with each other from Vajrahasta (called Vajrahasta IV in the later account), grandfather of the great Vajrahasta III (1038-70 A.D.) called Vajrahasta V in the later account. It is not possible to believe that Vajrahasta III made mistakes in recounting the names of his immediate predecessors and that his grandson Codagaṅga had more reliable information about them. We have to notice that even the name of the father of Vajrahasta III has been wrongly quoted in the later records of his grandson. There can therefore be no doubt that whatever is new in the later genealogy and is in conflict with the earlier account is imaginary and unreliable. It seems that Vajrahasta II Aniyāṅkabhīma (c. 982-1016 A.D.) was the founder of the family's greatness and that there was little authentic information about his predecessors upto Guṇārṇava, progenitor of the family, at the disposal of the court poets of Anantavarman Codagaṅga. The genealogy from the god Viṣṇu to this Guṇārṇava seems to be entirely fabricated, the fabrication depending on several factors,⁴⁰ the foremost amongst them being the eagerness of the medieval ruling families to trace their descent from a respectable source like the solar, lunar, Yādava, or Nāga lineage. The palpably unreliable nature of the mythical genealogy of the Čālukyas of Veṅgī and Kalyāṇa is quite well known to the student of Indian history.⁴¹

In an attempt to determine the date of the Bhārata War, Pargiter suggests an average of 18 years for a generation of the Purāṇic kings. But it is not possible to be sure about such averages. Thus the 17 kings of the Imperial Eastern Gaṅga dynasty from Vajrahasta III (who ascended the throne in 1038 A.D.) to Bhānu IV (who was ousted by Kapilendra in 1435 A.D.) ruled for 397 years, *i. e.* a little over 23 years in average, while, on the other hand, Chapters V-VIII of the *Rajatarāṅgiṇī*, which are regarded by scholars as quite satisfactory as a historical account, would give 34 rulers (from the accession of Avantivarman in 855 A.D. to the end of Jayasimha's rule in 1155 A.D.)⁴² reigning for a total of 300 years, *i. e.*, an average of a little less than 9 years. And, if the two groups are amalgamated, $17+34=51$ rulers would be found to have ruled for $397+300=697$ years, *i. e.* an average of about $13\frac{1}{2}$ years. The difficulty is that, when more than a hundred generations are involved, even the difference of one year would create a discrepancy of more than a century. But suppose we accept Pargiter's average of 18 years, then the more than hundred generations of the Ikṣvākus before Prasenajit (c. 500 B.C.) would cover a period above 1800 years, so

39. *Ibid.*, No. 1103. Nagara is probably the same as Kaliṅganagara.

40. We discussed the question in fuller detail in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 239-41.

41. See Sircar in *The Classical Age.*, ed. Majumdar, pp. 229-31. In the mythical part of the genealogy of the Eastern Čālukyas of Veṅgī, Parikṣit is represented as sixth in ascent from Udayana (contemporary of the Buddha, 566-486 B.C.), so that he was supposed to have flourished after 700 B.C. Cf. Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kīṣkindhā*, p. 13. This chronology seems to be absurd, another absurdity being the representation of Udayana and other members of his family as kings of Ayodhyā.

42. The date of Jayasimha's death is really learnt from a later chronicle. Kalhana's work was completed five years earlier about 1150 A.D.

that Manu must have flourished earlier than 2300 B.C. Even on an average of 10 years, the founder of the Ikṣvāku house has to be placed earlier than 1500 B. C. The question now is how to reconcile this chronology with the widely accepted views regarding the existence of the protohistoric Harappa or Indus Valley civilization in the third and second millennia B. C. and the advent of the Aryans about the middle of the second millennium B. C. Are Manu and his descendants to be regarded as Aryans or as Pre-Aryans? As the Purāṇas appear to represent them as Aryans, we have probably to regard them as mythical figures if we accept the theory of Aryan advent about the middle of the second millennium B. C.

It may be noticed that the Nonaryan association of some of the clans is quite pronounced. Thus the story of Yayāti of the lunar race suggests that his favourite son Puru, the progenitor of the Pauravas, was born of a Nonaryan princess, while his other sons (Yadu, Turvasu, Druhyu and Anu), whom he had cursed, became the progenitors of the despised Yādavas, Yavanas, Bhojas and Mlecchas respectively, the fourth category being sometimes possibly called Ānava Kṣatriya. In this connection, we should also note the dark complexion of the Yādava hero Kṛṣṇa and the well-known fact that Kṛṣṇa himself and some members of his family married Nonaryan girls. What is more important seems to be that Pūru, Yadu, Turvaśa, Druhyu and Anu are mentioned in the early Vedic literature as separate clans which are thus made kinsmen of one another in the Yayāti story exactly as the progenitors of the Aṅgas, Vaṅgas, Kalingas, Puṇḍras and Suhmas are made sons of the same father in the Purāṇic story of Dīrghatamas.

CHAPTER V

Past Perfect in
Samudragupta's Eran Inscription

Lines 9-10 of the fragmentary Eran pillar inscription, giving the first half of a stanza (verse 3 in the *Vasantatilakā* metre), were read by J. F. Fleet as follows :

— — *babhūva Dhanand-Āntaka-tuṣṭi-kopa-*
tulyaḥ U — U *manayena Samudraguptaḥ*.¹

He noticed the Past Perfect Tense in the verb *babhūva* and suggested that it probably refers to some predecessor of Samudragupta himself, on the ground that none of the names of his successors 'can be fitted into any of the places where letters are legible in lines 11-24'.² Several years ago, we proposed to restore the two missing syllables before *babhūva* as *putro* implying thereby that the passage speaks of Samudragupta himself as the son of Candragupta I, and not of any of his predecessors.³ In our opinion, the lost first verse of the inscription mentioned Candragupta I while his son Samudragupta was introduced in the following two stanzas. The epigraphic passage quoted above was later examined by Jagannath Agrawal in a paper read before the Jaipur Session (1951) of the Indian History Congress. In it,⁴ Agrawal advanced arguments to prove that the stanza in question refers to Samudragupta and not to any earlier Gupta monarch as supposed by Fleet, although he passed over the restoration proposed by us in silence. Like Fleet, he draws our attention to the Past Perfect Tense in the verb *babhūva*, but concludes that 'Samudragupta was not alive at the time the inscription was composed'. Thus, while Fleet assigned the Eran pillar inscription to the reign of Samudragupta, Agrawal regards it as a posthumous record. On this point, we are inclined to agree with Fleet as Agrawal's suggestion is based entirely on the evidence of the Past Perfect Tense in the verb *babhūva*, which is, in our opinion, no evidence at all. Both Fleet and Agrawal ignore the interesting fact that there are innumerable instances, in epigraphic Sanskrit poetry, of the use of the Past Imperfect (*Lañ*) and Perfect (*Liṭ*) Tenses for the Present Indicative (*Laṭ*).

It is well known that ancient Indian kings issued charters in respect of the grants made by them especially for the information of future rulers of their dominions

1. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III, 1888, p. 20.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

3. *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, 1942, p. 261. Verse 7 seems to speak of the erection of the pillar itself by one of Samudragupta's feudatories ruling over the district round Airikīṇa (Eran).

4. See *Proc. IHC*, Jaipur, 1951, pp. 62-63.

so that there might not be resumption of the gift lands at a later date. On this point the *Viṣṇusmṛti* has: *paṭe vā tāmra-paṭṭe vā likhitaṁ sva-mudr-āṅkitaṁ c=āgami-nṛpa-vijñāpan-ārthaṁ dadyāt*,⁵ while the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* says :

*Dattvā bhūmin=nibandhaṁ va kṛtvā lekhyam tu kārayet/
āgami-bhadra-nṛpati-parijñānāya pārthivaḥ*||⁶

As a matter of fact, the word *śāsana*, meaning 'a royal charter' and occurring in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*,⁷ has been explained by Vijñāneśvara in his *Mitākṣara* commentary as :

śiṣyante bhaviṣyanto nṛpatayo='nena.

In view of the above attitude of the Indians of old, it is no wonder that the action of a reigning monarch in respect of a grant made by him is often expressed in the charter, issued on the occasion, in the Perfect Tense, even though, as will be shown below, there are some other reasons underlying the representation of current events as past ones. Reference may be made in this connection to the Tezpur plates of king Vanamālavarman (ninth century A.D.) of Prāgjyotiṣa, recording a grant of the king himself in the following words :

*tasmai dadau śrī-Vanamāladevo
grāmaṁ sa mātā-pitr-punya-hetoḥ*.⁸

The verb used here is *dadau* in the Past Perfect Tense, although the dedication of the village was a current event. The same characteristic is also noticed in the Parbatiya plates of the same king, which has the verb *pradadau* in the Past Perfect Tense in a similar context :

*tatr=āgrajāya pradadau dvijāya
grāmaṁ hi Cūdāmaṇaye praśāsyā/
Haposa-nāmānam=iha prayatnāt
punye='hani prīti-manā narendrah||
mātā-pitror=ātmanaś=ca punya-yaśo'-bhivyddhaye
ataḥ sarvair=anumantavyam=iti*||⁹

Apparently an extension of the same conception is noticed in some charters which use both the Past Imperfect and Perfect Tenses in the description of other activities of their issuers. The following passages of the Khalimpur plate of king Dharmapāla (c. 770-810 A.D.) of Eastern India use the verbs *ullalāsa* and *prajājavāla* in the Past Perfect Tense in describing the exploits of Dharmapāla himself :

- (1) *samprāptāyāḥ parama-tanutām cakravālām phaṇānām
magn-onmīlan-maṇi-phaṇīter=lāghavād=ullalāsa* ;
- (2) *viruddha-viṣaya-kṣobhād=yasya kop-āgnir=Aurvatat/
anirvṛti prajājavāla catur-ambhodhi-vāritah*||¹⁰

5. III. 58.

6. I. 318.

7. I, 320.

8. P. N. Bhattacharya, *Kāmarūpasāsanāvalī*, p. 64.

9. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 156. The king's request contained in the prose sentence added to the stanza has to be noted.

10. A.K. Maitreya, *Gaudalekhamālā*, p. 13.

The copper-plate grants of Devapāla (c. 810-50 A.D.) similarly describe him as:
*urvīm==ā Varuṇa-niketanāc=ca sindhor=
 ā Lakṣmī-kula-bhavanāc=ca yo bubhoja.*¹¹

Although Devapāla was 'enjoying the earth' when the charters were issued, the verb *bubhoja* has been used here in the Past Perfect Tense. There are also instances of the use of the Past Imperfect Tense in similar contexts. Both the sets of the Baud plates of Prṭhivīmahādevī (tenth century A.D.) of Orissa have the following passage in the description of the ruling queen:

*prṭhivīm Prṭhivīmahādevī cira-kālam=apālayat.*¹²

The verb used here is *apālayat* in the Past Imperfect Tense.

It should, however, not be supposed that such use of the Past Imperfect and Perfect Tenses is confined only to the copper-plate charters which were avowedly meant for the information of future rulers. We have numerous cases of similar usage in the descriptions of both private and royal personages in stone inscriptions recording their activities. As to records of donation similar to the copper-plate grants, we may refer to the Nagarjuni cave inscription of Maukhari Anantavarman (fifth century A.D.) which has:

*grāmam=anapa-bhoga-vibhavaṁ ramyaṁ Bhavānyai dadau.*¹³

The Bhitari pillar inscription of Skandagupta (455-67 A.D.) describes the installation of a deity and grant of a village in its favour in the following stanza:

*iha c=ainam pratiṣṭhāpya supratīṣṭhita-śāsanah/
 grāmam=enam sa vidadhe pituḥ puṇy-ādhivṛddhaye//
 ato Bhagavato mūrtir=iyam yaś=c=ātra samśritah/
 ubhayaṁ nirdideś =āsau pituḥ puṇyāya puṇya-dhīh//*¹⁴

As regards the use of the Past Imperfect and Perfect Tenses in the descriptions in contemporary records of pious works other than donation, we have innumerable instances, only a few of which are quoted below. The Udayagiri cave inscription of the time of Candragupta II (376-413 A.D.) records the construction of a cave for the god Śiva by the king's minister Śāba-Vīrasena who was a resident of Pāṭaliputra, but accompanied his master to Malwa. The passage describing the said action, however, reads:

*bhaktiā Bhagavataḥ Śambhor=guhām=etām=akarayat.*¹⁵

The Gangdhar stone inscription (423 A.D.) of the time of king Viśvavarman of Daśapura records the construction of a temple and the excavation of a well by his minister Mayūrākṣaka in the following passages:

11. *Ibid.*, p. 35 ; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVII, p. 320 ; etc.

12. *JAS*, Letters, Vol. XIX, p. 120. Cf. queen Daṇḍimahādevī's description in her own grants (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol VI, p. 133 ; Vol. XXIX, p. 88, etc.) :

*īato Daṇḍimahādevī sūtā tasyā mahīyāsī/
 mahīm=ahīna-sāmarthyā cira-kālam=apālayat//
 avicchin-āyati-praṁśau vaṁśe Kara-mahībhrām/
 cihna-bhūtā patāk=eva yā babhūva vibhūṣaṇam//
 lāvany-āmṛta-nisyanda-sundaram dadhatī vapuḥ/
 y=ārājac =candra-lekh=eva vilasat-kīrti-candrikā//*

For the use of the Past Perfect and Imperfect Tenses in the same context see also further below.

13. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III, p. 277.

14. *Select Inscriptions*, p. 315.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 272.

(1) *veśm*=*atyugraṇi nṛpati-sacivo*=*'kārayat*=*puṇya-hetoḥ*;

(2) *kūpañ*=*c=ainam*=*akārayad*=*guṇa-nidhiḥ śrīmān*=*Mayūrākṣakaḥ*;

which are followed by the prayer:

tavat=kīrttir=bhavatu vipulā śrī-Mayūrākṣakasya.¹⁶

The Junagadh rock inscription (455-58 A.D.) of Skandagupta's reign records the reconstruction of the Sudarśana lake by the local governor Cakrapālita in the following stanza:

babandha yatnān=mahato nṛdevān=
abhyarcya samyag=ghaṭit-opalena
a-jāti-duṣṭam=prathitam tātākam
Sudarśanam śāśvata-kalpa-kālam||¹⁷

The Sarnath stone inscription (1026 A.D.) of the time of king Mahīpāla I records the king's pious deeds at Kāśī in the following passage:

Gaud-ādhipo Mahīpālaḥ Kāśyām śrīmān=akārayat.¹⁸

It will be seen from the passages quoted above that all of them have used the verbs either in the Past Imperfect or in the Past Perfect Tense in describing current events. Many more instances can be added to our list quite easily. Another interesting fact to be noticed in this connection is that sometimes an indiscriminate use of the Past Imperfect, Past Perfect and Present Indicative Tenses in the same context is noticed in the descriptions of ruling princes. A very clear instance of this is offered by the Barabar cave inscription of the Maukhari prince Anantavarman incised during the reign of his father Śārdūlavarman.¹⁹ In the description of the son and the father we have the verbs *alañcakāra* and *babhūva* in the Perfect, *acikarat* in the Aorist and *karoti* and *patati* in the Present Indicative. Cf.

bhūpanām Maukharīnām kulam=atanu guṇo='lañcakār=ātma-jātyā
śrī-Śārdūlasya yo='bhuj=jana-hṛdaya-haro='nantavarma suputraḥ
Kṛṣṇasy=ākṛṣṇa-kīrttiḥ Pravaraḡiri-guhām samśritam bimbam=etan=
mūrttam loke yaśaḥ svam racitam=iva mud=ācikarat=kāntimat=sah||
kālāḥ śatru-mahībhujām prañayinām=icchā-phalāḥ pādapo
dīpaḥ kṣatra-kulasya naika-samara-vyāpāra-śobhāvataḥ
kānta-citta-haraḥ Smara-pratisamaḥ pātā babhūva kṣiteḥ
śrī-Śārdūla iti pratiṣṭhita-yaśaḥ sāmanta-cūdāmaṇiḥ||
utpakṣm-ānta-vilohit-oru-tarala-spaṣṭ-eṣṭa-tārām ruṣā
śrī-Śārdūla-nṛpaḥ karoti viṣamam yatra sva-dṛṣṭim ripau
tatr=ākarma-vikṛṣṭa-śārṅga-śaradhi-vyastāḥ śaro='nt-āvahas=
tat-putrasya pataty=ananta-sukhadasy=Ānantavarma-śruteḥ||²⁰

Similarly, in the description of king Vanamālavarman in his own Tezpur plates, we have the following verbal forms: *cakre*, *akāri*, *viyagṛhuḥ*, *mumucuḥ*, *vijahuḥ*, *ūhe*, *vicarati*, *ajayat*, *udeti*, *gāyanti* and *abhavat*.²¹

16. *Ibid.*, p. 385.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 306-07.

18. *Gaudalekhamālā*, p. 108.

19. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III, p. 222.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 222-23. For similar cases in literary works, see below.

21. *Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī*, pp. 61-63.

On previous occasions, while commenting on the Sarnath inscription of Mahīpāla I, the Nāgarjuni cave inscription of Anantavarman and the Parbatīya plates of Vanamālarman, we tried to justify the use of the Past Imperfect and Perfect Tenses in the description of current events by pointing out not only that the writers of such epigraphic records had future readers in their minds, but also that the epigraphs were often engraved after the completion of the action involved in the performance of the pious deeds they refer to.²² It must, however, be admitted that epigraphs like the Barabar cave inscription quoted above exhibit a considerable amount of confusion in regard to the use of Tenses. Moreover, there are some cases of the use of the Past Perfect Tense, which cannot be explained with reference either to future readers or to the period intervening between the performance of an act and its recording in an epigraph and have to be attributed to the confusion about its use that must have existed in the minds of the students of Sanskrit grammar. In both the Tezpur and the Parbatīya plates of Vanamālarman, for instance, we have a stanza recording a speech of the goddess Lakṣmī, conceived as incarnated in a queen, justifying her choice of a king as her husband by pointing out that the king was an incarnation of her celestial husband Viṣṇu. The verse runs as follows:

varṇ-ādy-aśeṣa-guṇa-jātam = ayaṁ babhāra
patyur = mam = ātula-balasya Rathāṅgapāṇeh/
ten = āham = agramahiṣi jagatibhujo = 'sya
*bhūtvā jane na khalu lāghavam = abhyupaimi/*²³

Now Lakṣmī selected the king as her husband because he was adorned with the qualities of Viṣṇu. In spite, however, of the fact that the king was still living and continuing to enjoy the said characteristic as clearly supported by the Present Indicative Tense in *abhyupaimi*, the verb used to indicate the idea is *babhāra* in the Perfect Tense. We have here no case of *Parokṣa*, underlying the use of that Tense, as it is ordinarily understood. The poet may have used the Past Perfect Tense in this case on the ground that Lakṣmī was thinking of the time when she had selected the king as her husband, at a later date when she was justifying the selection in the speech recorded in the stanza. This reminds us of the following remark in Patañjali's *Mahabhāṣya* on the prevailing controversy among grammarians regarding the significance of *Parokṣa* :

kecit = tāvad = ahur = varṣa-śata-vṛttaṁ Parokṣam = iti/
apara āhuḥ kaṭ-āntaritaṁ Parokṣam = iti/
*apara ahur = dvya-aha-vṛttaṁ try-aha-vṛttaṁ c = eti*²⁴

"Some say that *Parokṣa* means the lapse of a century. Others say that what is screened from the eye of the speaker is *Parokṣa*. There are still others contending that an interval of two or three days constitutes *Parokṣa*."

It is believed that Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has been called an *a-kālaka* grammar²⁵ because he excluded from his purview the discussion of *Kāla* or the Tenses, on the

22. JAS, Letters, Vol. XVII, p. 27 ; Vol. XIX, p. 120; Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIX, p. 157. See also *Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī*, pp. 183-84.

23. *Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī*, p. 60 ; Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIX, p. 154.

24. Under Pāṇini, III. 2. 115 ; Kielborn's ed., Vol. II, p. 120.

25. Cf. the *Kāśikā* of Vāmana and Jayāditya on Pāṇini, II. 4.21. : IV. 3.115; VI. 2.14 ; Bala Sastri's ed. pp. 139, 179, 578.

exact definition of which subtle and elaborate arguments²⁶ were often advanced by the grammarians.²⁷ Indeed some of the passages cited above from epigraphic Sanskrit poetry clearly exhibit the confusion regarding the use of the Tenses referred to by early grammarians.

The same confusion is also noticed in many works of Sanskrit literature. The words *babhūva* and *bhavita* are both found in the description of Śavarṇi in the *Durgāsaptaśatī*²⁸ section of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, the former being regarded by commentators as a case of *bhāvinibhūtavat*=*upacārah*. The *Rāmāyaṇa* offers similar instances of the use of the Past Perfect for the Future Tense. Cf.

śādvaleṣu yathā śiṣye vanāntar=*vana-gocarā*/
kuth-āstarāṇa-yukteṣu kiṃ syāt sukhatarāṃ tataḥ||²⁹

Here *śiṣye* in the Past Perfect Tense means "I shall lie." Similarly in the following passage *siṣeve* in the same Tense has been used to mean "I shall climb" :

yat=*te pṛṣṭhām siṣeve*=*'ham sva-vaśā hari-puṅgava*.³⁰

The following passages of the same epic offer instances of the use of both the Past Imperfect and Perfect Tenses for the Present Indicative :

putrau Daśarathasya=*āstām bhrātarau Rāma-Lakṣmaṇau*.³¹

The verb *astām* in the Past Imperfect here means "there are."

adya mene vinihataṃ Vālinam yuddha-durmadam.³²

Here *mene* in the Perfect Tense means "I take it." There are many instances in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as in some of the examples quoted above from inscriptions, of the use of both the Past Perfect and Present Indicative Tenses in the same context. Cf.

- (a) *śiṣyire c*=*ābhibhūtāni santrastāny*=*udvijanti ca*/
sampraviviyathire c=*āpi na ca paspandire bhayāt*||³³
- (b) *anye bheriḥ samājaghmur*=*anye cakrur*=*mahā-svanam*/
keśān=*anye pralulupuh karnāv*=*anye daśanti ca*||³⁴
- (c) *vividhad*=*astra-samyogād*=*agnir*=*dahati tatra vai*/
nānā-vidhān grhāṃś=*citrān dadāha hutabhuk tadā*||³⁵
- (d) *śara-homa-samiddhasya vidhūmasya mah-ārciṣaḥ*/
babhūvus=*tāni līṅgāni vijayaṃ darśayanti ca*||³⁶

26. See Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini, III. 2.115 and 123 ; Kielhorn's ed., Vol. II, pp. 110-20, 123-24 ; also Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī*, Nirṇayasagar Press ed., pp. 336-37, Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, pp. 295-96 ; Kielhorn, *A Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, pp. 268-69.

27. Cf. V. S. Agrawala, *India as known to Pāṇini*, 1953. pp. 23-24.

28. I. 2 ; XIII. 17 ; Venkatesvar Press ed., pp. 43, 276.

29. See Nirṇayasagar Press ed., II. 30. 14.

30. *Op. cit.*, V. 67. 38.

31. *Op. cit.*, III. 19. 15.

32. Calcutta Sanskrit Series ed., IV. 12. 6.

33. Nirṇayasagar Press ed., VI. 22. 13.

34. *Op. cit.*, VI. 60. 51.

35. *Op. cit.*, VI. 75. 13.

36. *Op. cit.*, VI. 80. 9.

- (e) *n=aiva jyātala-nirghoṣo na ca nemi-khura-svanah/
śuśruve caratas=tasya na ca rūpaṁ prakāśate*||³⁷

These are only a few of the peculiar uses of the Tenses found in the epic.³⁸ For an instance of the Present Tense used in place of the Past, reference may be made to the following stanza of the *Skanda Purāṇa*:³⁹

*Kānyakubje mahākṣetre rājā Bhoj-eti-viśrutaḥ/
purā puṇya-yuge dharmyaḥ prajā-dharmaṇa śāsati*||

37. *Op. cit.*, VI. 80. 26.

38. See *Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda*, Vol. I, pp. 301 ff.

39. *Prabhāsa-khaṇḍa, Vastrāpātha-māhātmya*, VI. 20.

CHAPTER VI

The Chandahsūtra and Chandomakhānta

I

We have seen that the Classical Sanskrit metres were not quite popular long before the beginning of the Christian era.¹ After the Śaka occupation of Ujjayinī, that city appears to have become a great seat of Sanskrit learning. It is interesting to note that Rudradāman's Junagadh inscription (150 A.D.)² is one of the earliest known Sanskrit records written in a developed *Kāvya* style and that a few epigraphic records belonging to the Śaka Satraps of Mathurā, who flourished about the beginning of the Christian era and one record of a West Indian Śaka who seems to have ruled in the third century A.D. are the earliest Sanskrit inscriptions that contain verses in the Classical metres.³ The question raised in this connection is related to two other problems, viz. the dates of (1) Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* and (2) Piṅgala's *Chandahsūtra*. The first of the two questions has been discussed above ; a few suggestions about the latter are offered in the following lines.

Weber assigned the work on Sanskrit prosody ascribed to Piṅgala to a period about the close of that of the Vedic Sūtra literature and the commencement of the astronomical and algebraical literatures.⁴ He also suggested that Piṅgala's Chapters I and II on Vedic prosody are older than the other chapters dealing with Classical metres. H.P. Sastri believed in a story of the *Aśokāvadāna*, and assigned the author of the *Chandahsūtra* to about 300 B.C.⁵ M. Ghosh tried to prove that the Vedic and Classical parts of the work have to be attributed to two different authors and that the Vedic part should be assigned to circa 600 B.C.⁶

Weber was against a very early date for Piṅgala, because in the *Chandahsūtra* numerals have been expressed by words.⁷ Though a few words are supposed to have

1. See Chapter III on Introduction of Classical Sanskrit in Epigraphic Records (above, pp. 25ff.).

2. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 36ff. ; *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 175ff.

3. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 200, No. 7 ; Vol. XVI, p. 232 ; *Sel. Ins.*, pp. 122, 187. The word *khānāpita* for *khānita* used in the third century inscription (from Sanchi) referred to above is Prakrit and would suggest that the system of Pāṇini's grammar could not eradicate the Prakrit influence from Western India even as late as the third century A.D.

4. *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, pp. 60, 231 ; *Indische Studien*, VIII, pp. 173, 178.

5. *JBORS*, Vol. VI, p. 24.

6. *IHQ*, Vol. VII, pp. 728ff.

7. *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, p. 60.

been used as numerals even in the later Vedic literature,⁸ the elaborate system followed by the author of the *Chandaḥsūtra* cannot but be late. In the Chapters dealing with Vedic metres, Piṅgala has used the words *vasu*=8, *āditya*=12, *dik*=10, *rudra*=11, *ṛtu*=6, and *ṛsi*=7. The use of *ṛtu* in the sense of 'six' seems to be especially important; because it points to a date when six as the number of the seasons was stereotyped. The *Vedic Index*⁹ points out, "Three seasons of the year are often alluded to...A more usual division (not found in the *Ṛgveda*) is into five seasons...sometimes six seasons are reckoned...A still more artificial arrangement makes the seasons seven..." These facts show that the number of the seasons was not stereotyped in a very early period. Inscriptions moreover prove that the official year was divided into three seasons as late as the second or third century A.D. The Brāhmī inscriptions of the Scytho-Kuṣāṇa age¹⁰ prove that the three seasons in which the official year was divided were the summer (*grīṣma*), rains (*varṣā*) and winter (*hemanta*), each consisting of eight fortnights or four months. Six as the number of the seasons was, therefore, not stereotyped long before the rise of the Guptas in the fourth century A.D. If this is remembered, Chapters II and III of the *Chandaḥsūtra* cannot possibly be assigned to a period much earlier than the Gupta age.

The Chapters dealing with classical metres again have used the words *samudra*=4, *ṛsi*=7, *vasu*=8, *rasa*=6, *ṛtu*=6, *indriya*=5, *kāmaśara*=5, *svara*=7, *dik*=10, *rudra*=11, *āditya*=12, *māsa*=12, *bhūta*=5, and *veda*=4. Of these, at least the world *kāmaśara* indicating 'five' can hardly refer to a pre-Gupta date. Kāma, as a member of the family of Brāhmaṇical gods, is not late; but his five arrows appear to be late, probably not much earlier than the Gupta age.¹¹ It, therefore, seems that, whatever be the date of Piṅgala, the present *Chandaḥsūtra*—both its Vedic and Classical parts—is not a pre-Gupta work.

As has been pointed out by Ghosh,¹² the numbers of the *jāti*, *viśama* (*ardhasama*) and *samavṛtta* metres are 8, 7 and 38 respectively in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*; but they are 30, 35 and 76 respectively in the *Chandaḥsūtra*. The *Chandaḥsūtra* in its present form is, therefore, later than the *Nāṭyaśāstra* which is assigned by different scholars to a period between 400 and 700 A.D.¹³ The *Chandaḥsūtra* cannot, therefore, be placed earlier than the fifth century A.D.

To the points that have been raised above, it may be added that a portion of the present text of the *Chandaḥsūtra* is apocryphal, and it may be suggested that the

8. Cf. G.H. Ojha, *Palaeography of India*, 1918, p. 121.

9. See Vol. I, pp. 110f.

10. See *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 120, 136, 138, 150, 153, 157, 161-162 (mentioning *māsa*); also pp. 163, 198, 201-03, 207-08, 210-12, 223, 230-33, 237-39, etc. (mentioning *pakṣa*). The foreigners used the names of the months of both the Parthian and Indian calendars and may have been responsible for the use of *māsa* (for *pakṣa*) gradually without reference to the season. See above, p. 29.

11. The *Milindapañha* speaks of the *pañc-āyudha* or five weapons which are enumerated by some as the sword, spear, bow, battle-axe and shield. The five arrows of Kūma, which may be associated with the said conception, are enumerated in the stanza—*sañmohan-onmādanau ca soṣaṇas=tāpanas=tathā/ stambhanaś=c=eti Kāmasya pañca-bāṇāḥ prakīrtitāḥ*|| The verse is also found as—*unmādanau/ soṣaṇaṁ ca tathā sañmohanau/ viduḥ/ soṣaṇaṁ māraṇaṁ c=aiva pañca bāṇā Manobhuvah*|| or *ime smṛtāḥ*|| Soon, however, the god's weapons were conceived as made of flowers, and he was called Puṣpadhanuḥ or Kusumeṣu, the flower-arrows being enumerated as—*aravindam=aśokaṇi=ca cūṭāni=ca nāyamallikā/ nīlotpalāni=ca pañc=aite Pañcabāṇasya sūyakāḥ*|| See Childers' *Pali Dictionary*, s.v. *pañc-āyudha*; Kṣīrasvāmin's commentary on the *Amarakoṣa*, l. 25-26; Apté's *Sans.-Eng. Dict.*, s.v. *pañcan*.

12. *IHQ*, Vol. VII, p. 727.

13. S. K. De, *Sanskrit Poetics*, pp. 23ff. ; Winternitz, *Gesch. Ind., Lit.*, Vol. III, p. 8. See above, pp. 21ff.

work belongs not to a particular author called Piṅgala, but to a school, possibly founded by Piṅgala.

The very nature of the first part of Chapter VIII of the *Chandahsūtra* appears to indicate a later date. This part describes some additional *Samavṛtta* metres, and it is very interesting to note that the metre *Gaurī* (VIII. 5) is exactly the same as the metre *Cañcalākṣikā* defined earlier in VI. 27. A quite different metre called *Gaurī* has moreover been described in VII. 4. These facts appear to prove that the first part of Chapter VIII (if not the whole of this Chapter) of the *Chandahsūtra* is a later addition. It must also be noted in this connection that the additional metres described there are not found in the section on metrics in the *Agni Purāṇa*¹⁴ which largely draws upon the *Chandahsūtra*.

As regards the chronological relation of the *Chandahsūtra* with Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, it may be pointed out that some manuscripts of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* follow a recension that utilises, in its section on metrics, Piṅgala's code of algebraical symbols like *ma*, *na*, *bha*, etc. This recension of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is, therefore, certainly later than the *Chandahsūtra* or at least the original text of the *Chandahsūtra*.

II

D.C. Acharya published an interesting account of a work on prosody, called *Chandomakhānta* by Bhaṭṭa Puruṣottama in the *Memoirs of the Varendra Research Society*, Rajshahi, No. 5. His account is based on a fragmentary manuscript of the work in the said Society's Library. Acharya has tried to establish the following facts:—

- (1) Puruṣottama was the teacher of Gaṅgādāsa, author of the *Chandomañjarī*;
- (2) Gaṅgādāsa was probably a contemporary of Jayadeva and was not later than the 14th century;
- (3) Puruṣottama's work belongs to a school of metricians, the chief of whom was Śvetamāṇḍavya.

A careful consideration of his arguments would, however, show that all his conclusions are untenable.

I. Acharya quotes the following verse from the *Chandomañjarī* in order to prove that Puruṣottama was the teacher of Gaṅgādāsa (I. 21) :

Śvetamāṇḍavya-mukhyās=tu munayo n=ecchanti yatim |
ity=āha Bhaṭṭaḥ sva-granthe gurur=me Puruṣottamaḥ ||

He has evidently overlooked the fact that the verse is preceded by the following sentence : *ayaṁ ca ślokaś=Chandogavinde mama guror=Gaṅgādāsasya*. This sentence shows beyond doubt that the verse in question was not composed by Gaṅgādāsa, author of the *Chandomañjarī*, but was quoted from the *Chandogovinda* by his *guru* whose name was also Gaṅgādāsa. It is interesting to note that Gaṅgādāsa's *Chandogovinda* is found quoted in the *Ṛttaratnākarādarśa*¹⁵ composed by Divākara, son of Mahadeva, in 1684 A.D. This teacher Gaṅgādāsa was, according to the verse quoted above, the pupil of Puruṣottamabhaṭṭa. Therefore, Puruṣottama flourished about half a century earlier than Gaṅgādāsa, author of the *Chandomañjarī*.

14. Ch. 334.

15. Cat. Cat., Vol. I. s.v.

II. According to Acharya, the well-known stanza —

mas=tri-gurus=tri-laghuś=ca na-kāro
 bh-adi-guruḥ punar=adi-laghur=yah |
 jo guru-madhya-gato ra-la-madhyaḥ
 so='nta-guruḥ kathito='nta-laghus=tah ||

occurring in the *Chandomañjarī* (I.8) was originally composed by Gaṅgādāsa, author of the *Chandomañjarī*, and since it is found quoted in the *Ṛttaratnākara-pañjikā* by Rāmacandra-Kavibharatī written at the beginning of the 15th century A.D., the *Chandomañjarī* cannot be placed later than the 14th century. It should, however, be pointed out that the same verse has been quoted by Bhaṭṭa Utpala in his commentary on the *Bṛhaṭsamhita*,¹⁶ and Utpala, we know, wrote his commentary on the *Bṛhajjātaka* in Śaka 888 = 966 A.D.¹⁷ The verse, therefore, certainly belongs to an author who lived before the middle of the 10th century A.D.

Acharya also says, "Again, the *Chandomañjarī* quotes a stanza from Jayadeva as not observing metrical pause. This stanza is quoted in such a way that, it seems, Jayadeva was his contemporary." The suggestion is absolutely without any ground. After quoting the verse from Gaṅgādāsa's *Chandogovinda*, the *Chandomañjarī* says, *ata eva Murāriḥ*, and then quotes a verse from the *Anargharāghava*; next it says, *Jayadevo*='pi, and quotes a verse of Jayadeva (author of the *Candrāloka* or *Alaṅkāra-nirūpaṇa*); then it concludes, *evam*=*anye*='pi, and quotes a fourth verse. It is evident that Gaṅgādāsa, author of the *Chandomañjarī*, lived after Jayadeva, that is to say, certainly after the beginning of the 13th century.¹⁸

III. Acharya points out that, although the *Chandomakhānta* has a section on *gīta-ṛtta* or songs, Puruṣottama does not quote any verse from Jayadeva (author of the *Gitagovinda*). He tries to explain the situation by offering two alternative suggestions: (1) either Puruṣottama was earlier than Jayadeva, (2) or he, too, was a contemporary of Jayadeva, but did not like to quote a rival poet.

The section on *gīta-ṛtta*, however, itself shows that Puruṣottama was later than the author of the *Gitagovinda*, who popularised that particular form of Sanskrit poetry. The illustrations in the section in praise of Śiva and Pārvatī composed by Puruṣottama himself, also exhibit obvious influence of Jayadeva's *Gitagovinda* (end of the 12th century A.D.). Cf.

sahacari darśaya tam=atula-mattam |
 svapna-samāgama-mohita-cittam || Dhru ||
 avirata-mukulita-locana-mālam |
 dīpa-śikhā-lasad-ikṣaṇa.-bhāram || 1 ||
 sphatika-manohara-gaura-śarīram |
 prakāṣa-jaṭā-juṭa-vigalita-nīram || 2 ||
 bhāla-vibhūṣita-himakara-khaṇḍam |
 kuṇḍali-kuṇḍala-maṇḍita-gaṇḍam || 3 ||
 śṛṅga-damarukam=atula-virājam |
 Vidhi-Hari-sevita-carāṇa-sarojam || 4 ||
 śṛṅgu Puruṣottama-bhaṇitam=udārām |
 prabhur=api kalayati vividha-vikāram || 5 ||

16. See the introduction to the commentary on the Chapter entitled *Grahagocara* (Ch. 103 or 104 '.

17. Cf. Keith, *Hist. Sans. Lit.*, p. 534.

18. See *Hist. Sans. Lit.*, ed. S. N. Dasgupta, p. 462.

Puruṣottama, whose own verses prove him to have been a staunch Saivite, here represents Śiva as worshipped by Vidhi and Hari. His devotion for Śiva evidently prevented him from quoting any verse from Jayadeva who wrote only in praise of Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu.

IV. It seems to us that there was no single metrician of the name Śvetamāṇḍavya. In the *Brhatsamhitā* (104.3), Varāhamihira mentions Māṇḍavya as the greatest authority on metres, and Utpala-bhaṭṭa quotes in his commentary two verses in the *Sragdharā* metre composed by Māṇḍavya. According to the *sūtra—anyatra Rāta-Māṇḍavyābhyām* of the *Chandaḥsūtra* (7.35) ascribed to Piṅgala, the *Caṇḍavṛṣṭi-prapāta* variety of the *Daṇḍaka* metre, which has 27 syllables in a quarter, was known by a different name to Rāta and Māṇḍavya who had given the name *Caṇḍavṛṣṭiprapāta* to an altogether different metre. This point is not quite clear in the *Chandaḥsūtra*, but has fortunately been explained by Bhaṭṭa Utpala in his commentary on the *Brhatsamhitā*, Ch. 104, Utpala says that Piṅgala and other metricians call the metre *Caṇḍavṛṣṭiprapāta*; but Rāja (i.e. Rājan) and Māṇḍavya call it *Suvarṇa*. Cf. *daṇḍakaś=Caṇḍavṛṣṭiprayāta-samjñāḥ saptaviṃśaty-akṣara-pādo bhavati Piṅgal-ādinām=ācāryānām matena Rāja-Māṇḍavyau varjayitvā | tayos=tu mate eṣa Suvarṇ-ākhyah | tathā ca tāv=ucatuḥ |*

Suvarṇaś=Caṇḍavegaś=ca Plavo Jīmūta eva ca |
Balāhako Bhujāṅgaś=ca Samudraś=c=eti Daṇḍakāḥ ||
tathā ca pāṭh-āntaram |
Arṇo='rṇavaḥ Plavaś=c=aiva Jīmūto='tha Balāhakaḥ |
Samudraś=ca Bhujāṅgaś=ca sapt=aite Daṇḍakāḥ smṛtāḥ ||

It is clear that Rājan of Utpala is the same as Rāta of the *Chandaḥsūtra*. The facts that their names have been jointly mentioned in the works of Piṅgala and Utpala and there is the passage *tāv=ucatuḥ*, i.e., 'they both say', before the verse suggest that the verse has been quoted from the joint work of the two metricians. It appears that Śvetamāṇḍavya of the verse quoted in the *Chandomañjarī* is a compound of two names and that Śveta is the same as Rāta of Piṅgala and Rājan of Utpala. The fact that *rā* as the first syllable of the name is common both in the works of Piṅgala and Utpala and that *ta* as the second syllable is common in the *Chandaḥsūtra* and the *Chandomañjarī* would suggest that the *Chandaḥsūtra* which reads *Rata* gives the correct name of the metrician. Scholars generally place the *Chandomañjarī* of Gaṅgādāsa in the 15th or 16th century A.D.¹⁹ A Tanjore manuscript of this work belongs to the last quarter of the 17th century.²⁰ Puruṣottama's *Chandomakhānta* may, therefore, be roughly assigned to the 14th or 15th century A.D.

19. Krishnamachariar, *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 909.

20. *Loc. cit.*

CHAPTER VII

Kāvya Style in the Post-Śātavāhana Epigraphs

G. Bühler in his famous monograph entitled *Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie* (*The Indian Inscriptions and the Antiquity of Indian Artificial Poetry*)¹ proved the existence of a flourishing *Kāvya* literature in Sanskrit and Prakrit during the first five centuries of the Christian era and showed that a great period of literature following the style of the poetic school of Vidarbha (Berar) lies before the middle of the fourth century A.D. The poetic citations in the *Mahābhāṣya*² by Patañjali (generally placed in the second century B.C., but is probably later in its present form), exhibiting metres characteristic of artificial poetry, such as *Mālātī*, *Pramitākṣarā*, *Prakarṣiṇī* and *Vasantatilakā* and many verses in the *Anuṣṭubh* agree fully, as regards contents and the mode of expression, with the court *kāvyas*.³ The *Buddhacarita* (translated into Chinese between 414 and 421 A.D.) by Aśvaghoṣa, said to have been a contemporary of Kaṇiṣka (78-101 A.D.), also shows a marvellous

1. It was translated from German in *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XLII, 1913; see reprint in *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vols. II (1963-69) and III (1963-70). Bühler very thoroughly analysed the following four *prastis*: (1) Mandasor inscription mentioning the Gupta emperor Kumāragupta I (413-55 A.D.) and his Aulikara feudatory Bandhuvārman of Daśapura and bearing the dates Mālava (Vikrama) 493 and 529 (436 and 473 A.D.), which was composed by a poet named Vatsabhāṭṭi; (2) Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta (c. 335-76 A.D.), composed by *Sādhivigrahika-Kumārāmātya Mahādandanāyaka* Hariṣeṇa; (3) Junagadh inscription of the Śaka *Mahākṣatrapa* Rudradāman I, dated Śaka 72 (150 A.D.); and (4) Nasik inscription of the 19th regnal year of Pulumāvi (c. 130-59 A.D.). For the said epigraphic records, see Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 29ff., 262ff., 175ff., 203ff. Bühler is specially critical of Max Müller's views expressed in the latter's work, *India, what can it teach us?* (pp. 281ff.). Max Müller's first proposition was that the Indians did not exhibit any literary activity during the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. as a result of the inroads of various foreign races; and Bühler now pointed out that the above suggestion is disproved by the Junagadh and Nasik inscriptions, both of the middle of the second century A.D., the first of the two being really issued by the Pahlava (Parthian) governor of Surāstra (South Kathiawar) under the Scythian *Mahākṣatrapa*. The second proposition advocated by Max Müller was that the real period of the bloom of the Indian *kāvya* literature should be placed in the middle of the sixth century A.D.; and against this Bühler drew attention to the *prastis* of the Gupta period including the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta and the Mandasor inscription mentioning Kumāragupta I and Bandhuvārman. Bühler's contention was that there were more than one period of the bloom of *kāvya* literature and that, considering Vatsabhāṭṭi's palpable borrowing from Kālidāsa's works, the greatest Indian poet may be assigned to a period before the date 472 A.D. when the Mandasor inscription was set up. Bühler also pointed out the improbability of assigning Sakāri-Vikramāṇitya of Indian legends to the 6th century A.D. He further showed how the arguments in favour of assigning Kālidāsa to the sixth century A.D. are all absolutely unsatisfactory. See above, p. 25.
2. For some stanzas in the Classical metres found in inscriptions of the Śakas of Mathurā ruling about the beginning of the 1st century A.D., see Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, p. 122 (cf. p. 187); *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 200. See also above, p. 27 and note 9.
3. It is interesting to note that the famous Nanaghat inscription of Nāganikā, which may be placed in the 1st century B.C., uses such figurative expressions as *sāgara-girivara-valyāya paṭhaviya pathama-vira*, etc. See also below.

development of the *kāvya* style. The description of the literary capacity of Śaka Rudradāman (c. 130-50 A.D.) in the Junagadh record as *sphuṭa-laghu-madhura-citra-kānta-śabda-samay-adar-ālankṛta-gadya-padya-kāvya-vidhāna-praviṇa* which marvellously agrees with the principles of the Vaidarbhī style explained by Daṇḍin⁴ and Bharata⁵ and the prose style of the Junagadh record (150 A.D.) itself and the Nasik inscription of the time of Rudradāman's Śātavāhana contemporary Vasiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi show, according to Bühler,⁶ that 'in the second century, there had been many superior and more elaborate compositions ; because the author of the Girnar (i.e. Junagadh) inscription was only an obscure provincial writer and the author of the Nasik inscription was only a court poet of the Andhra (i.e. Śātavāhana) king'. Another Prakrit inscription, written in the *Kāvya* style but not noticed by Bühler, is the Hāthi-gumphā (near Bhubaneswar, Puri District, Orissa) inscription⁷ of Kharavela who flourished in the first century B.C., i.e. more than a century before Vasiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi and Rudradāman.

Bühler has in this connection examined, from *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, some eighteen inscriptions, which are partly or wholly metrical and of definitely known date, including the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta described as a *kāvya* by its author Hariṣeṇa, the Junagadh inscription of Gupta 136-38 (456-58 A.D.) described as a *grantha* and the Mandasor inscription of Malava 529 (473-74 A.D.) described as a *praśasti* by its author Vatsabhaṭṭi. The dates of the records examined fall in the period between 350 and 550 A.D. From the great number of similar inscriptions of the period, Bühler suggested that in the above period 'the use of the *kāvya* style in inscriptions, especially in longer ones, was in vogue and, from this very circumstance, it follows that court poetry was zealously cultivated in India.'

It should be noticed that, in considering the question, Bühler did not take into account the inscriptions of the Vākāṭakas and other successors of the Śātavāhanas. The reason seems to be that early writers like Bühler and Kielhorn did not think the records of many of these dynasties, e.g., the Vākāṭaka records, to be earlier than the middle of the sixth century A.D. It was, therefore, easy for Bühler to remark, "It is, however, very questionable whether the poetic art had reached in Southern India that degree of development which it had reached at the special centres of intellectual life in Northern India."⁸ By 'Southern India' he seems to have understood the territory to the south of the Kṛṣṇā river, because he is not expected to forget the Nasik inscription of Pulumāvi's reign. However, evidence shows that Bühler's doubts are unjustified. As regards the Deccan, the fact cannot be ignored that the Vaidarbhī-rīti or the poetic style of Vidarbha exhibited by Kālidāsa's works developed there and was apparently patronised at the court of the Vākāṭakas of Vidarbha. We have seen that the Prakrit language, which was gradually dying out from North Indian inscriptions as early as the second or third century A.D., lingered on in the records of Southern India as late as the middle of the fourth century. It is also true that many of the Southern inscriptions are written in a matter-of-fact style. But that the *kāvya* style was cultivated in Southern India is perfectly established by a number of inscriptions.

4. *Kāvyaadarśa*, I. 41-42.

5. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Ch. XVI.

6. See *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. III, p. 220, note 1 (Ofprint, p. 77, note 1).

7. *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 214ff.

8. *Loc. cit.*

especially those belonging to the family of the Kadambas. The poetic genius of the author of the Nasik inscription of Vasiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi, analysed by Bühler himself, was certainly inherited by his successors at the Vākātaka and Kadamba courts and, patronised by the Calukyas, found in Ravikīrti, a rival of Bhāravi and Kālidāsa.

The Vākātakas ruled over the greater part of the Deccan before the rise of the Calukyas about the middle of the sixth century. All the Vākātaka grants are therefore to be assigned to a period anterior to 550 A.D. Most of their records are, however, written in elegant Sanskrit prose; but the prose style is not so much artificial as that of the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. As Bühler rightly remarked, it was a familiar custom in the fifth century to glorify the erection of temples and other edifices, by means of poetical compositions. The Vākātaka records, it should be noted, are mostly ordinary land grants and cannot, therefore, claim to have been written in the style of *praśastis*, *granthas* or *kāvyas*. But the prose style of the records is as much artificial as that of the contemporary ordinary land grants belonging to the Guptas. We know that Daṇḍin defines *ojo-guṇa* as *samāsa-bhūyastva* and describes it as the very life of artificial prose.⁸ This *ojas* is characteristic of the prose style of the Vākātaka records. The Chammak, Dudia and other records⁹ of Pravarasena II (middle of the fifth century A.D.) describe the Vākātaka king Pravarasena I in a phrase containing no less than thirtysix syllables. The Bhāraśiva relatives of the Vākātakas are described in several inscriptions as *aṁsa-bhāra-sanniveśita-Śivaliṅg-odvāhana-Śiva-suparituṣṭa-samutpādita-rājavanśānām parākram-adhigata-Bhāgī-rathy-amala-jala-mūrdh-ābhiṣīktānām daś-āśvamedh-āvabhṛtha-snānānām* (33+21+11 syllables). The plurality of adjectival phrases, reference to epic characters in passages like *Yudhiṣṭhira-vṛtti* and the length of sentences in these records exhibit the artificial nature of the style. It should also be noted that verses are sometimes found in the prose inscriptions of the Vākātakas. The seal of the Poona plates¹⁰ of Prabhāvatigupta, for example, has the following verse in the *anuṣṭubh* metre and Vaidarbhī style:

*Vākātaka-lalāmasya krama-prāpta-nṛpa-śriyaḥ/
jananya yuvarājasya śāsanam ripu-śāsanam||*

The figures of speech exhibited by this verse are *Anuprāśa* and *Yamaka*. Records like the Ajanta inscription¹¹ of the Vākātaka king Hariṣeṇa (c. 480 A.D.) are wholly metrical and show that the poetic genius of the Vākātaka court poets was of no mean order. This record is fragmentary; but the existing *pādas* show that many metres characteristic of artificial poetry were used by the poet. *Pādas* like *Purandar-opendra-sama-prabhāvaḥ sva-bāhu-vīry-ārjita-sarva-lokaḥ*, *Pravarasenah pṛthu-pīna-vakṣaḥ sarorūhākṣaḥ kṣapit-āri-pakṣaḥ*, etc., and the only existing complete verse:¹²

*Ari-narendra-mauli-vinyasta-maṇi-kirṇa-līlha-kram-āmbujah/
Pravarasenas=tasya=putro='bhūd=vikasan-nav-endivar-ekṣaṇaḥ||*

8. *Kāvyaadarśa*, I. 70—*ojas samāsa-bhūyastvam = etad = gadyasya jīvitam*.

9. Cf., e.g., *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 442ff.

10. *Ibid.*, 1965, pp. 435ff.

11. *Ibid.*, pp. 449ff.

12. Kielhorn is inclined to describe the metre of this verse as a species of *mātrā-samaka*; but Venkata-subbia takes it to be a variety of *gītikā* (see *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. V, p. 114). This metre with slight variation is found in lines 1-2 of the Tazim inscription (*Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 270), verses 1-24 of the Talgunda record (*Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., pp. 474f.) and at p. 4 of the Bower MSS. In the 5th to the 7th century, the metre seems to have been in use in different parts of India.

prove that the author of the Ajanta record tried to show his skill in the *kāvya* style. Repetition of the hard sound *kṣa* in the line *Pravarasena*, etc., seems to indicate influence of the Gauḍī-rīti of Sanskrit composition.¹³

The earliest records of the successors of the Śātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan are written in Prakrit prose. That the influence of the Śātavāhana court poets was still working on their successors in South Indian courts is proved by the artificial style exhibited by some of the Ikṣvāku records discovered at Nagarjunikonda. The artificial nature of the style of the Ikṣvāku court poets is shown not only by the *ojo-guṇa* and the length of sentences in the Ikṣvāku inscriptions, but also by the mode of glorifying the Buddha and the reigning king's ancestor with a large number of epithets, some of which exhibit figures of speech characteristic of the *kāvya* style. Most of the Nagarjunikonda records begin with an adoration to Lord Buddha and one¹⁴ of them has—*namo bhagavato deva-rāja-sakatasa supabudha-bodhino savaṃñño sava-sat-ānukāṃpakasa jita-rāga-dosa-moha-vipamutasa mahāgaṇi-vasabha-gaṃdhahathisa Sammasabudhasa dhātuvara-parigahitasa*. In another¹⁵ of these records, the adoration is—*namo bhagavato Ikhāku-rāja- pravara-risi-sata-pabhava-vaṃsa-bhava-sa deva-mānusa-sava-sata-hita-sukha-maga-desikasa jita-kāma-kodha-bhaya-harisa-tarisa-moha-dosasa dapita-māra-dapa-māna-pasamana-karasa dasabala-mahabalasa aṭhaṃga-maga-dhamacaka-pavata-kasa caka-lakhaṇa-sukumāra-sujāta-caraṇasa taruṇa-divasa-kara-pabhasa sarada-sasi-sama-darisanasa sava-loka-cita-mahitasa Budhasa* (4+20+19+19+18+9+14+16+11+12+10 syllables). At least the figurative expressions *taruṇa-divasakara-pabha* and *sarada-sasi-sama-darisa* are conceived quite in the *kāvya* style. But such is not only the case with the adoration; the earlier king, Caṃtamūla I, is generally glorified in his son's and grandson's records¹⁶ as *Virūpakha-pati-Mahāsena-parigahitasa agihot-agithoma-vājapey-asamedha-yājisa hiraṇa-koṭi-go-satasahasā-hala-satasahasā-pada-yisa savathesu apatihata-saṃkapasa Vasīṭhi-putasa Ikhākūsa siri-Caṃtamūlasa* (16+17+22, etc., syllables).

Early Sanskrit records of the South-Eastern Deccan are written in prose. They are not composed on special occasions like erection of temples or other edifices and are not to be classed with *gadya-kāvya*s. But that the writers of these records were not unfamiliar with the artificial style of Sanskrit prose is proved by the *ojo-guṇa* of the records. Reference may be made to the description of Mādhavavarman I in the records of the Viṣṇukunḍin family. The Chikkulla copper-plate grant¹⁷ (7th century A.D.) describes him with seven epithets, the longest having no less than fifty-five syllables. The longest epithet describing Mādhavavarman I in the Ramatirtham plates¹⁸ contains as many as forty-nine syllables. It is, however, better to refer to the Ipur and Polamuru plates¹⁹ of Mādhavavarman I himself who ruled in c. 535-85 A.D.

13. In connection with the development of *kāvya* style in the Vākāṭaka period, reference may be made to the Prakrit poem entitled *Setubandha* described by Bāṇa in his *Harṣacarita* as composed by Pravarasena who is often identified with the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II, though the identification is probably not certain.

14. *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., pp. 228-29.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 233.

16. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 231-32.

17. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IV, pp. 193ff.

18. *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, pp. 133ff.

19. *Ibid.*, Vol. XVI, pp. 334ff.; *Journ. Dept. Lett.*, Calcutta University, Vol. XI, pp. 31ff.; Sircar, *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas*, pp. 334ff.

Ipur plates—*smṛti-mati-bala-sattva-dhairya-vīrya-vinaya-sampannaḥ sakala-mahīmaṇḍala-manujapati-pratipūjita-śāsanas* = *Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuvatī-hṛdaya-nandanah* *sva-naya-bala-vijita sakala-sāmant-ātula-bala-vinaya-naya-niyama-sattva-sampannaḥ sakala-jagad-avanipati-pratipūjita-śāsano* = 'gniṣṭoma-sahasra-yāji-hiranyagarbha-prasūta *ekādaś-āsvamedh-āvabhṛtha-vidhūta-jagat-kalmaṣaḥ* *susthira karma-mahārāja-śrī-Mādhavavarmā* (18+21+19+32+18+16+18+14 syllables).

Polamuru plates—*ātula-bala-parākrama-yaśo-dāna-vinaya-sampanno daśaśata-sakala-dharaṇīṭala-narapatir* = *avasita-vividha-divyas* = *Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-parama-yuvati-jana-viharaṇa-ratir* = *ananya-nṛpati-sādharaṇa-dāna-māna-daya-dama-dhṛti-mati-kṣānti-śaury-audārya-gāmbhīrya-prabhṛty-aneka-guṇa-sampaj-janita-raya-samutthita-bhūmaṇḍala-vyāpi-vipula-yaśāḥ kratu-sahasra-yāji hiranyagarbha-prasūta* = *ekādaś-āsvamedh-āvabhṛtha-snāna-vigata-jagad-enaskaḥ sarvabhūta-parirakṣaṇa-cūṇcur* = *vidvad-dviya-guru-vṛddha-tapasvi-janāśrayo mahārājaḥ śrī-Mādhavavarmā* (19+16+25+60+7+8+20+11+15+4+6 syllables).

The Early Kadambas, who established themselves in the South-West Deccan in the first half of the 4th century, were subdued by the Early Calukyas about the middle of the sixth when the latter established themselves at Bādāmi. Excepting the Talagunda inscription²⁰ of Śāntivarman (c. 435-70 A.D.), however, no other early record of the Kadambas can be said to have been composed on special occasions like the inscriptions examined by Bühler. Nevertheless, the small Kadamba records, many of which are wholly or partly metrical, contain in them verses which are specimens of excellent poetry. We give below a collection of the *namaskāra* verses from different records of the Early Kadambas and the reader will see that they would make a *maṅgalācaraṇa* suitable to any work of the best writers of Sanskrit poetry.

Jayati bhagavān Jinendro guṇarundrah prathita-parama-kāruṇikah/
trailoky-āśvāsakari dayā-patāk = *occhritā yasya* ||²¹
Jayaty = *arhaṁs* = *trilokeśaḥ sarva-bhūta-hitamkaraḥ/*
rāg-ādy-ari-haro = 'nanto = 'nanta-jñāna-dṛg-īśvaraḥ ||²²
Jayati sur-āsura-makuṭa-pranihita-carana-yugaḥ/
daṇḍa-kamaṇḍalu-hastaḥ padma-pravar-āsano Brahmā ||²³
Jayaty = *udrikta-daityendra-bala-vīrya-vimardanaḥ/*
jagat-pravṛtti-saṁhāra-sṛṣṭi-māyādhara Hariḥ ||²⁴
Jitam = *bhagavatā tena Viṣṇuṇā yasya vakṣasi/*
Śrīḥ svayaṁ bhāti devaś = *ca nābhi-padme Pitāmahaḥ* ||²⁵
Jayaty = *ambuja-gehāyāḥ patir* = *Viṣṇuḥ sanātanaḥ/*
Varāha-rūpeṇa dharāṁ yo dadhāra yuga-kṣaye ||²⁶
Jayati viśvadeva-saṁghāta-nicit-aika-mūrtiḥ sanātanaḥ/
Sthānūr = *indu-raśmi-vicchūrta-dyutī-maj-jaṭā-mukūṭa-maṇḍanaḥ* ||²⁷

20. *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., pp. 474ff.

21. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI, p. 23 ; *Suc. Sat.*, pp. 255, notes.

22. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VII, pp. 34, 35, 36 ; *Suc. Sat.*, pp. 260, 287. In the first record, we have *kite rataḥ*.

23. *Ep. Carn.*, Vol. IV, pp. 130, Hs. No. 18 ; *Suc. Sat.*, p. 265, note.

24. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, p. 16 ; *Suc. Sat.*, p. 297, note.

25. *Mys. Arch. Surv.*, 1925-26, p. 98 ; *Suc. Sat.*, p. 292, note.

26. *Mys. Arch. Surv.*, 1918, p. 35 ; *Suc. Sat.*, p. 304, note.

27. *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., p. 474 ; *Suc. Sat.*, p. 257, note.

Jayati dhruva-bal-endu-jāta-mukūta-maṇḍanaḥ|
*asādhyā-nidhanaḥ Śambhur=viśveśo jagatām patih||*²⁸
Hara-Nārāyaṇa Brahma-tritayāya namaḥ sadā|
*śūla-cakr-ākṣasūtr-odgha-bhava-bhāsita-pāṇine||*²⁹
Sūry-āṁśu-dyoti-parīṣikta-pāṅkajānām
śobham yad=vahati sad=āśya pāda-padman|
devānām=makūta-maṇi-prabh-ābhīṣiktaṁ
*Sarvajñas=sa jayati sarva-loka-nāthaḥ||*³⁰

The first of these verses written in the *Āryā* metre occurs in several inscriptions, the earliest belonging to the time when Kākusthavarman was a *yuvarāja* about the beginning of the fifth century.

When we find such beautiful lines as the following in a small and quite ordinary grant like the Halsi plates³¹ of Mṛgeśavarman's eighth year (5th century A.D.), we cannot but think that the Kadamba court poet was a consummate artist :

Kadamba-kula-satketor=hetoh puṇy-aika-sampadām|
śrī Kākustha-narendrasya sūnur=bhānur=iv=āparah||
śrī-Śantivarav urm=eti rājā rājiva-locanaḥ|
khal=eva vanit=ākṛṣṭa yena lakṣmīr=dvisad-grhat||
Tat-priya-jyeṣṭha-tanayaḥ śrī-Mṛgeśa-narādhipaḥ|
lok-aika dharma-vijayī dviḥa-sāmanta-pūjitaḥ||
Matva dānaṁ daridrānām mahāphalam=it=iva yaḥ|
svayaṁ bhaya-daridro='pi śatrubhyo='dān=mahad-bhayaṁ||
Tuṅga-Gaṅga-kul-otsādi Pallava-pralay-analaḥ, etc.

To illustrate how the writer of an ordinary small land grant brings in epic characters, we may refer to the Bennur plates³² of Kṛṣṇavarman II. Cf.

Yathā Yudhiṣṭhirasy=eva śālāyām yasya santatam|
Brahmaṇānām sahasrāṇi samaśnāti yathāsukham||
Sa rājā rāja-rājasya pranaptā Kṛṣṇavarmanaḥ|
pautraḥ śrī-Viṣṇudāsasya putraḥ śrī-Simhavarmanaḥ||
Śaśvad-brahmottaraṁ kurvan prajāś=ca paripālayan|
Mahi-vinihata-mitraḥ Kṛṣṇo jayatu Kṛṣṇavat||

In this connection we should also note that the Bannahalli plates³³ of the same king describe his grandfather Viṣṇuvarman as *gāndharva-hastīśikṣā-dhanurvedeṣu Vatsarāj-Endr-Ārjuna-sama* and *śabd-ārtha-nyāya-vidvat*. We are here to notice not only the reference to epic and historical characters like Vatsarāja, Indra and Arjuna, but also to the fact that Kadamba Viṣṇuvarman claimed to have been skilled in *gāndharva* (music), *śabda* (grammar, or the science of words), *ārtha* (their *vācya*, i.e., expressed, *lakṣya*, i.e., indicated, and *vyāṅgya*, i.e., suggested import) and *nyāya* (logical method). It is interesting that the poet (*kavi*) Śāba-Vīrasena, the *saciva* of Candragupta II, describes himself in the Udayagiri cave inscription³⁴ as skilled in

28. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIV, p. 165 : *Suc. Sat.*, p. 277, note.

29. *Ep. Carn.*, Vol. VI, p. 91 : *Suc. Sat.*, p. 290, note.

30. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 90.

31. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI, p. 21.

32. *Ep. Carn.*, Vol. V, p. 594.

33. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, p. 16.

34. *Sel. Ins.*, op. cit., p. 280. Cf. Kautsaḥ Śāba iti khyāto Vīrasenaḥ kul-ākhyayā / śabd-ārtha-nyāya-lokajñāḥ=kaviḥ Pāṭaliputraḥ. Cf. also the epithet *pada-padārtha-vicāra-suddha-buddhi* applied to Umāpatidhara, court poet of Lakṣmaṇasena, in the Deopara inscription (Majumdar, *Ins. Beng.*, p. 49).

śabda, *artha*, and *nyāya*. Evidently Kadamba Viṣṇuvarman claimed to have been a musician and poet like Samudragupta and his court encouraged artists like that of the Gupta king and of the Śaka king Rudradāman.

The metrical portions of Early Kadamba records generally contain fine verses written in the Vaidarbhī style. As it is not possible to quote all of them, we satisfy ourselves with two verses in the *Upajāti* metre from a little charter³⁵ of the time of Ravivarman (close of the 5th century A.D.) :

Śrī-Viṣṇuvarma-prabhṛtīn=narendrān=
 nihatya jitvā prihivīm samastām/
 utsādyā Kāñc-iśvara-Canḍadandam
 Palāśikāyām samavasthitāḥ saḥ||
 Raviḥ Kadamb-oru-kul-āmbarasya
 guṇ-ānśubhir=vyāpya jagat samastām/
 mānena catvāri nivartanāni
 dadau Jinendrāya mahīm mahendrah||

A few stanzas may also be quoted from Ravivarman's Davangere copper-plate grant³⁶ which is written in twenty three stanzas :

Nṛpa-cchalena kiṁ Viṣṇur=ddaitya-jīṣṇur=ayam svayam/
 hiraṇmaya-calan-mālaṁ tyaktvā cakram vibhavitam||
 Sāmrajye nandamāno='pi na mādyati paramitapaḥ/
 Śrīr=eṣā madayatya=anyan=atipit=eva vāruṇ||
 Narmad-āntā mahi prityā yam=aśrity=ābhinandati/
 kaustubh-ābh-aruṇa-cchāyam vakṣo Lakṣmīr=Harer=iva||.....
 Viśvā vasumatī nāthan=nāthate naya-kovidam/
 dyaur=iv=Endram jvalad-vajra-dīpti-korakit=aṅgadam||
 Yasya mūrdhni svayam Lakṣmīr=hema-kumbh-odara-cyutaiḥ/
 rājy-ābhiṣkam=akarod=ambhoja-śabalair=jalaiḥ||

As we have seen, the only Early Kadamba inscription that was composed as a eulogy on a special subject is the Talagunda record³⁷ of Śāntivarman. It describes how a tank was excavated by Kakusthavarman, father of Śāntivarman, for a temple of Śiva. It is written in verse. Verse 34 of the record says that a poet named Kubja was responsible for the composition of the *kāvya* which the author himself wrote on stone. The poet cannot be ranked with the best writers of Sanskrit poetry; but his literary talent was not of a mean order. Kubja's *kāvya* is written in 34 verses which exhibit such metres as *Puspitagrā*, *Indravajrā*, *Vasantatilakā*, *Mandākrāntā*, *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* and *Pracita* (a variety of *Daṇḍaka*). The first 24 verses are, however, composed in a metre rarely found in Classical Sanskrit works.³⁸ We give here an analysis of the Talagunda inscription.

The inscription may be conveniently divided into four parts; Part I contains *maṅgalācarana* and *namaskāra*; Part II deals with the early history and glories of the family to which the hero of the performance belongs. Part III contains a description of the hero and his performance, and Part IV conclusion and benediction.

35. See *Ind. Ant.*, Vol VI, pp. 29-30.

36. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 90-91.

37. See *Sel. Ins.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 474ff.

38. Kielhorn has fully described it in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII. pp. 26ff.

Part I. The record begins with the auspicious word *siddham* and a verse in adoration to *Sulānu*, i.e., Śiva. The *namaskāra* is then extended to learned *Brahmanas* well-versed in the *R̥k*, *Yajus* and *Sāma Vedas*.

Part II. *Kākusthavarman*, the hero of the performance, is introduced, as well as the family to which he belonged. Then comes the story how the family was named *Kadamba* owing to its early members tending a *Kadamba* tree with care. The birth of *Mayūrasarman*, the founder of the *Kadamba* family, and his exploits; his quarrel with the *Pallava* king of *Kāñcī* and victorious campaigns against the *Pallavas* and *Bṛhad-Bāṇas*; his installation by the king of *Kāñcī* on the throne of the kingdom lying between the *Preharā* and the *Western Ocean*; description of his *abhiṣeka* by *Sadānana* and the *Mothers*, and introduction of his son *Kaṅgavarman*, grandson *Bhagīratha* and great-grandson *Raghu*—all these come one after another.

Part III. Description of *Raghu's* brother and successor *Kākusthavarman*, the hero of the performance, and of the prosperity of the *Kadamba* kingdom during his reign; how his daughters were married to princes of the *Gupta* and other royal families, and how his feudatories obeyed him; how he constructed a *taḍāka* near the *siddhālaya* (temple) of *Bhagavat Bhava*, i.e., Śiva, which had been occasionally visited by such ancient kings as *Sātakarṇi*—these follow one another.

Part IV. Adoration to the *Bhagavat*, i.e., Śiva, residing at *Sthānakundūra* i.e. *Talgunda*, in the kingdom of king *Śāntivarman* who used to wear three diadems. Benediction—Let there be happiness for the dwelling (i.e., the temple) and prosperity for the subjects.³⁹

39. For specimens, cf.

Samśritas = *tadā mahīpālān* = *ārādhyā yuddheṣu vikramaiḥ*/
prāpa paṭṭa-bandha-sampujān kara-pallavaiḥ *Pallavair* = *ddhṛtām*//
Bhaṅgur-ormmi-valgitair = *nṛtyad-Aparāṇav-āmbhaḥ-kṛt-āvadhīm*/
Prehār-āntām = *ananya-samīcaraṇa-samaya-sthitām bhūmim* = *eva ca*//
Vibudha-saṁgha-mauli-sammṛṣṭa-caran-āravindaḥ = *Sadānanah*/
yam = *abhiṣiktavān* = *anudhyāya senāpatiḥ Mātṛbhis* = *saha*//.....
Gupt-ādi-pārthiva-kul-āmburutha-sthalāni
sneh ādara-pranaya-sambhrama-kesarāṇi/
śrīmanty = *aneka-nṛpa-ṣaṭpada-sevitāni*
yo = *'bodhayad* = *duhitṛ-didhitibhir* = *nṛp-ārkkah*//.....
Tasy = *aurasasya tanayasya viśāla-kīrtteḥ*
paṭṭa-tray-ārppaṇa-virājita-cāru-mūrtteḥ/
śrī-Śāntivarman-nṛpater = *vvara-śāsanasthaḥ*
Kubjas = *sva-kāvyam* = *idam* = *aśma-tale lilekha*//

CHAPTER VIII

Lexical Value of Viṣṇuṣeṇa's Charter

As we shall see below, Viṣṇuṣeṇa's charter comes from the Gujarat region and belongs to the close of the sixth century A.D., and its importance lies in the fact that a large number of words used in the document are not known from Sanskrit lexicons. In the following lines, we propose to interpret the record section by section.

1. *Svasti || Lohatā-vāsakāt=paramabhaṭṭāraka-śrī-Bava-pād-anudhyāto mahākārttakṛtika-mahādaṇḍanāyaka-mahāpratihāra-mahāsāmanta-mahārāja-śrī-Viṣṇuṣeṇaḥ kuśalī sarvvān=eva svān=rāja-rājaputra-rājasthānīy-āyuktaka-viniyuktaka śaulkika-corodddharanika-vailabdhika-cāṭa-bhaṭ-ādin=anyāś=ca yathāsambadhyamānakān=ādeśa-vikṣepa-kāriṇaḥ dhruv-adhikaraṇaṁ ca samājñāpayati |*

The document records an order, issued from the *vāsaka* (residence) at Lohatā by a ruler named Viṣṇuṣeṇa (called Viṣṇubhaṭa in the endorsement) who is endowed with the subordinate titles *Mahākārttakṛtika*, *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*, *Mahāpratihāra*, *Mahāsāmanta* and *Mahārāja*. The real meaning of *Kārttakṛtika* is unknown; but it may have indicated a royal agent or a judge of a superior court or an officer, like the present-day Legal Remembrancer, inviting the king's attention to what was done or left undone. *Daṇḍanāyaka* was either a leader of the army or the chief of the police with power of judging criminal offences.² *Mahāpratihāra*, literally 'the great door-keeper', was the chamberlain probably exercising some authority on the palace-guards and the royal bodyguards.³ It is interesting to note that precisely the same five feudatory titles, the *pañca-mahāśabda*,⁴ are also known to have been used by Dhruvasena I (Gupta-Valabhī 206-26=325-45 A.D.) of the Maitraka dynasty of Valabhī,⁵ although to whom exactly he owed allegiance is difficult to determine in the absence of further light on the subject.

1. *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1942, p. 360, note 9.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 260, note 1.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 33, note 9.

4. Cf. *Rājatarāṅginī*, IV. 140-43 and 680; *IHQ*, Vol. XXIII, p. 226. In the South Indian records, *pañca-mahāśabda* seems to refer to the privilege to enjoy the sounds of five kinds of musical instruments (*Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 276, note).

5. Cf. Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, Nos. 1304-05.

The order of *Malāsāmanta-Mahārāja* Viṣṇuśeṇa was addressed to his subordinates and officials such as the *Rājan*, *Rājaputra*, *Rājasthānīya*, *Āyuktaka*, *Viniyuktaka*, *Śaulkika*, *Coroddharanika*, *Vailabdhika*, *Drāṅgika*, *Cāṭa* and *Bhaṭa*, to other officials executing the ruler's orders as well as to the *Dhruvādhikaraṇa*. *Rājan* and *Rājaputra* apparently refer to subordinate rulers and their sons put in charge of administrative units. *Rājasthānīya* means a feudatory or viceroy.⁶ *Āyuktaka* possibly means a magistrate or executive officer appointed by the king and *Viniyuktaka* (the same as *Tadāyuktaka*, *Tanniyuktaka* or *Tadviniyuktaka*) an officer of a similar category appointed by the viceroy.⁷ *Śaulkika* is of course a customs officer and *Coroddharanika* a police officer in charge of the recovery of stolen goods, mentioned as the *Yukta* or officer in the *Manusmṛti* (VIII. 34). *Vailabdhika* is derived from the word *vilabdhī* used in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (VII. 161-63) probably in the sense of an assignment. The *Drāṅgika* must have been the officer in charge of a *draṅga* which is explained as 'a town' in the lexicons and used in the sense of 'a town or village' in Jain literature, but is known to have the sense of 'a watch-station' in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (VIII. 2010).⁸ *Cāṭa* and *Bhaṭa* are often taken to mean regular and irregular soldiers respectively, although their duty appears to have been something like that of the policemen, watchmen or peons. Instead of *Cāṭa*, some inscriptions use the word *Chātra*, often explained as 'an umbrella-bearer'.⁹ It is interesting to note that the word *Chātra* has actually been used in the sense of 'a court peon' in the inscription under discussion.

Viṣṇuśeṇa's order was addressed not only to the subordinates and officials, but also to the *dhruv-ādhikaraṇa*, i.e. the office of the *Dhruva*, the mention of which connects our epigraph with the Maitraka dynasty and with the Kathiawar region of Gujarat. The expression *dhruv-ādhikaraṇa*, *dhruvasthān-ādhikaraṇa* and *dhruv-ādhikaraṇika* are often found in the records of the Maitrakas of Valabhī. *Dhruva* has been explained as being still used in Kathiawar and Kutch to denote 'a person who superintends, on behalf of the Rājā, the collection of the royal share of lands', and *Dhruva* is still a surname among the Gujarati people.¹⁰ Another fact possibly connecting Viṣṇuśeṇa with the Gujarat State, if not with the Maitrakas themselves, is his interesting epithet *paramabhaṭṭāraka-śrī-Bāva-pād-ānudhyāta*, i.e. meditating on (or, favoured by)¹¹ the feet of the illustrious *Bāva* who was a paramount ruler. This reminds us of the fact that, in several Maitraka records, *Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja-Parameśvara* Śīlāditya III (Gupta-Valabhī 343-65=662-84 A.D.) is represented as *paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara-śrī-Bāva-pād-ānudhyāta*, while his son Śīlāditya IV is endowed with the same epithet with the only substitution of the word *Bappa* (i.e. 'father') for *Bāva*. Fleet explained *bāva* as indicating an uncle or a relation of the father's generation.¹²

6. *Sel. Ins.*, p. 391, note 5.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 360, note 7 ; p. 351, note 1 ; p. 234, note 3.

8. Cf. Stein, *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, Vol. II, pp. 291f.

9. Cf. *Sel. Ins.*, p. 414, note 5.

10. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 404, note 1 ; *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 190, note ; H. D. Sankalia, *Archaeology of Gujarat*, p. 201 and note.

11. Cf. *Sel. Ins.*, p. 454, note 3.

12. *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 186, note.

In connection with the possible relation of the issuer of our record with the Maitrakas, reference should also be made to his name, viz. *Viṣṇuṣeṇa* or *Viṣṇubhaṭa*. We know that the names of the Maitraka kings ended usually with the word *seṇa*, but sometimes also with the word *bhaṭa*.¹³ What is, however, more interesting is that, as in the case of *Viṣṇuṣeṇa-Viṣṇubhaṭa*, sometimes a Maitraka ruler is found to have borne a name ending with both *seṇa* and *bhaṭa*. We know that Maitraka Dhruvasena II Bālāditya (Gupta-Valabhī 310-21=629-40 A.D.), who was the son-in-law of king Harṣa of Kanauj, has been mentioned in the *Si yu-ki* of Hiuen-tsang by the name *Dhrūbhaṭa* or *Dhruvabhaṭa*.¹⁴

We have seen that *Mahāsāmanta Mahārāja Viṣṇuṣeṇa* (*Viṣṇubhaṭa*) claimed some relation with his overlord described as *paramabhaṭṭāraka śrī-Bāva*. The date of the document, which, as we shall see, is 592 A.D., as well as its possible place of issue somewhere in the Gujarat region would suggest that this overlord was probably the Kalacuri king Śaṅkaragaṇa whose Abhona plates are dated in Kalacuri 347 (595 A.D.).¹⁵ This seems to be supported by other facts. The Sarsavni plates of Kalacuri Buddharāja, son of Śaṅkaragaṇa, dated in the year 361 (609 A.D.),¹⁶ were issued from Ānandapura which may be the modern Ānandapura in Kathiawar or Vaṇnagar in Gujarat.¹⁷ Dadda I of the Gurjjara house of Nāṇḍipurī (Nandor in the old Rajpipla State) and Broach is described as *Gurjjara-nṛpati vaṁśa mahodadhau śrī-saha-janma Kṛṣṇa-hṛday-āhit-āspadaḥ kaustubha-maṇir=iva*¹⁸ with a probable allusion to his allegiance to Kalacuri Kṛṣṇa, father of Śaṅkaragaṇa. The Kalacuris certainly extended their power over the northern Maratha country and Malwa¹⁹ and probably also over some adjoining regions. King Kṛṣṇa's coins, styled *Kṛṣṇarāja-rūpaka* in the Anjaneri inscription of Pṛthivīcandra Bhogaśakti, dated 709 A.D., are not only found in the Nasik District, but also in the islands of Bombay and Salsette.²⁰ The above facts no doubt suggest that the Kalacuris very probably succeeded in extending their power over wide regions of the Gujarat State and that, from the middle of the sixth century A.D., all rulers of that region, bearing subordinate titles, owed allegiance to them. It may further be noted that the date of our inscription falls in the period between the rule of the Maitraka king Dharasena II (Gupta-Valabhī 252-70=571-89 A.D.) and that of Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya (Gupta-Valabhī 286-90=605-09 A.D.). Thus if *Viṣṇuṣeṇa* (*Viṣṇubhaṭa*) actually belonged to the Maitraka dynasty, his rule may be accommodated between 589 and 605 A.D., although it has to be admitted that the introductory part of the epigraph under study does not follow that of the Maitraka records. But if *Lohātā*, and not *Valabhī*, was his headquarters, it is possible to suggest that he was ruling side by side with the Maitraka king or kings of *Valabhī*, even though he belonged to the same family or a branch of

13. Cf. names like Dharasena (I-IV), Dhruvasena (I-III) and those like *Dhrūbhaṭa* and *Derabhaṭa* (Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 394). The name-ending *bhaṭa* also occurs in the contemporary ruling family of the Gurjaras of Nāṇḍipurī.

14. Cf. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, pp. 246-47.

15. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, No. 1206.

16. *Ibid.*, No. 1208.

17. See H. D. Sankalia, *The Archaeology of Gujarat*, p. 262 (map), p. 265 (map).

18. Cf., e. g., *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIII, pp. 82, 88.

19. They granted lands in the Nasik region and issued charters from Ujjayinī and Vaidīśa (Vidīśā); cf. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, Nos. 1206-08.

20. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, p. 229.

it. Lobhāṭa is, however, mentioned as Lobhāṭakagrā na in the endorsement and may have been merely a village in the dominions of Viṣṇuṣeṇa.

II. *astu vaḥ samviditaṁ yathā vijñāpto* = 'ham vaṇig-grāmeṇa yath = āsmākaṁ loka-saṁgrah-ānugrah-ārtham = ācāra-sthiti-pātram = ātmīyaṁ prasādikurvvanu]

III. *tan* = *mayā bhūtapūrvvasya janapadasya* = *ābhutapūrvvasya ca parirakṣaṇa-sanniveśanāy* = *ātmīyaṁ sthiti-pātraṁ prasādikṛtam*]

The inscription says that Viṣṇuṣeṇa had been approached by the community of merchants, apparently of Lobhāṭa as suggested by the endorsement, with the request of being favoured with the ruler's *ācāra sthiti-pātra* which they might utilise in protecting and favouring their own people (*loka-saṁgrah-ānugrah-ārtham*) and that the merchants were actually favoured with the ruler's *sthiti-pātra* used in the protection and settlement of the people of his dominions (*janapadasya* . . . *parirakṣaṇa-sanniveśanāy*). This *sthiti-pātra* or *ācāra-sthiti-pātra* is elsewhere also called *anugraha-sthiti-pātra*, *sthiti-vyavasthā* and *sthiti-pātra-vyavasthā* and is actually a long list of regulations which look like prevalent customary laws without much modification. At the end, king Viṣṇuṣeṇa (Viṣṇubhaṭa) further says that, in addition to the *ācāras* quoted, he also approved of other *ācāras* that were handed down from ancient times. He ends with the request that his *anugraha-sthiti-pātra* should be approved and followed by the future rulers of the country. The executor (*dūtaka*) of the document was Bhaḍḍaka who was an officer of the department of war and peace (*sandhivigraha-ādhikaraṇ-ādhikṛta*). The main document ends with the date and the representation of Viṣṇuṣeṇa's signature. The said list of regulations or customary laws, which is full of obscure and technical words, is very valuable not only to a lexicographer, but also to the student of ancient Indian history. We know of an *ācāra-vyavasthā* embodied in the Lakshmeshwar Kannada inscription²¹ (c. 725 A.D.) of Yuvarāja Vikramāditya II of the Cālukya house of Badami; but that record is small and damaged and is not of any help in the elucidation of the text of the *ācāras* quoted in the inscription under discussion. Some of the *ācāras* are mentioned in the Anjaneri plates of Bhogaśakti and Tejovarma.²² A record of Śaka 973 (1050 A.D.) from Sudi (Dharwar District, Mysore) registers the *śāsana-maryādā* granted to the eight Setṭis (merchants) and eighty households of the village.²³

We propose to quote below the text of the seventy-two *ācāras* separately and make an attempt to explain them one by one.²⁴

21. *Ibid.* Vol. XIV, pp. 190-91.

22. *Ibid.*, Vol. XXV, p. 237—*Samagiri-vāstavyānāṁ vaṇijāṁ candr-ārka-kūlikāṁ śulkaṁ = ādeyaṁ samasta-rājye n = āsti/ aparaṁ ca opura-dhanaṁ n = āsti/ umbara-bhedaḥ rājapuruṣāṇām = āvāśako jemakaś = ca etan = n = āsti/ kumār-sāhase rāpakāṇām = oṣṭ-ottara-śatam/ saṁgrahane dvātriṁśad-rāpakāḥ karna-troḍanikāyāṁ śoḍaśa rāpakāḥ/ śira- sphoṭane catvāri rāpakāḥ/ blāri-kāyāṁ vaṇik-puṭṭas = aṣṭottara-śatam/ rāpakāṇām/ naṅge grhītasya yac = c = aṣṭau śoḍaśa vā nagara-mahallakā vicārya vadaṁte tad = eva pramāṇam/*

23. *Ibid.*, Vol. XV, pp. 77ff. According to it, the shops and households were granted immunity, from all imposts, including the fixed land rent for two *grāhes* (years); thereafter they were to be charged with the usual dues (*sarv-āya*). The rules regarding the eight Setṭis were not to apply to the country, nor those of the country to the Setṭis. The guilt of a father should not affect the son, nor the guilt of a son his father. If a shopkeeper would strike a thief, robber, burglar, enemy or an evil-minded person in the verandah near the screen of the shop, there should be neither guilt nor fine; but if he would strike them elsewhere, he would have to be fined 6 *gadyāṇas*.

24. In interpreting some of the words and in bringing out the significance of some of the *ācāras*, we received help from a number of our friends. The list reminds us of Kātyāyana's view quoted in Devaṇṇa-bhaṭṭa's *Smṛticandrikā*, Vol. III, Part i, p. 58: *deśasy = anumaten = aiva vyavasthā yā nirūpita/ likhita tu sadā dhāryā mudritā rāja-mudrayā/ śāstra-vad = yatnato rakṣyā tāṁ nirakṣyā vinirṇayet*. It seems to recognise *rāja-śāsana* among the sources of law,

IV. *Yatr=ādau tāvat=prathamam=aputrakam na grāhyam.*

Aputraka means 'the property belonging to a person who died without leaving a son'.²⁵ The *ācāra* seems to say that such property should not be confiscated by royal officials disregarding the claim of any legal heir other than the son.

V. *Unmara-bhedo na-karaṇīyo rāja-puruṣeṇa.*

This is probably connected with IV above. The royal officials are asked not to break open or violate the *unmara*, the meaning of which is unknown. It may be related to the word *udumbara* (Pali *ummāra* : Parkrit *ummara*; Gujarati *umbro*, *umro*, 'threshold'). The reference may be to the threshold or door of a house. Viṣṇu (V. 116) prescribes a fine of 100 *paṇas* for a *sa-mudra-grha-bhedaka* (one who breaks open the sealed door of a house); but Kauṭilya speaks of 48 *paṇas* as the fine for the same offence (*Arthaśāstra*, III. 20).

VI. *Udbhāvaka-vyavahāro na grāhyah.*

The word *vyavahara* here may be taken in the sense of 'a law-suit'; but the real meaning of *udbhāvaka* is uncertain. It may, however, refer to a case carelessly put before the court (cf. *udbhavana*, 'neglect') or to one based on fabrication or false allegation.

VII. *Śaṅkayā grahaṇam n=āsti.*

This is apparently related to VI above. The royal officials should not go in for the apprehension of persons or for taking up a case against one or for seizing one's things through mere suspicion (*śaṅkā*) of a crime.

VIII. *Puruṣ-āparādhe strī na grāhyā.*

This means to say that the wife should not be apprehended for her husband's guilt.

IX. *Kṣem-āgni-samutthāne chalo na grāhyah.*

The word *chala* ordinarily means 'a pretext'. But, in the Smṛti literature, it is used in the sense of 'a careless declaration', while *bhūta* means 'a solemn statement of truth'.²⁶ The word occurs in X, XII and XXXIV below. Although the technical meaning seems to be preferable, the ordinary meaning of the word may be applied to all the cases, especially to XXXIV. *Kṣem-āgni* seems to mean 'sacred fire' such as is kindled on the occasion of marriage, etc. If we follow the technical sense of *chala*, the *ācāra* may mean that no half-hazard allegation should be entertained against one's neighbour for the burning of one's house when, according to the accused, the conflagration resulted from the sacred fire kindled in his house. But, if the ordinary meaning of the word is preferred, this may refer to a case involving the burning of a neighbour's house, in which the plea that the conflagration was due to the sacred fire kindled in the house of the accused would not be acceptable.

X. *Svayam hrasite karṇe chalo na grāhyah.*

This means that (1) there was no pretext for a man who was himself responsible for cutting a bit from a neighbour's ear, or that (2) no careless accusation was

25. See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 291 and note 13.

26. Cf. *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, N. S. Press ed., p. 130: *chalam nirasya bhūtena vyavahāraṇ=nayen=nṛpaḥ*, where the *Mitākṣarā* explains *chala* as *pramād-ābhīhita* and *bhūta* as *tattv-ārtha-samyukta*. In all our cases, *chala* may probably also mean, as in *Marāṭhi*, harassment or persecution or, in the present case, prosecution.

acceptable from a man in regard to the cutting of a bit from his own ears. Cf. *karmma-troṭana* in XL below. If *hrasita* may be taken in the sense of 'sounded', the reference may also be to a case in which the details of a dispute had previously reached the ears of the judge who was thus in a position to detect the fabricated element in the statement put up to him without investigation.

XI. *Arthi-pratyarthinā vinā vyavahāro na grāhyaḥ.*

A law suit could be taken up for disposal only when the complainant and the defendant were both present and never in the absence of either of the parties.

XII. *Āpaṇe āsanasthasya chalo na grāhyaḥ.*

This means either that (1) the pretext of being engaged in work at the shop should not justify the absence of a party to a law-suit from the court (cf. XI above), or that (2) no careless statement of accusation was acceptable from a person who had been at the time of occurrence busy in selling things in a shop or market (cf. XXIV below).

XIII. *Go-śakaṭam na grāhyam.*

This seems to be related to XIV below:

XIV. *Samant-amātya-dūtānām=anyeṣāṃ c=ābhyupāgame śayanīy-āsana-siddhānām na dāpayet.*

When a subordinate chief, an officer or an envoy of the king came to a village, the inhabitants thereof should not be compelled to supply beds or couches, seats and boiled rice. Some of these things, however, are known to have been usually supplied by the villagers, and the kings are found to have exempted gift villages from these obligations. Cf. such *parihāras* or exemptions as *a-kūra-collaka-vināśi-khaṭvā-samvāsa* and *a-paramparā-balivarda-graḥaṇa* explained in the *Successors of the Śatavāhanas*, pp. 187ff. It may be pointed out that inscriptions speak of supplying bullocks to the touring officials by the inhabitants of different villages in succession, but not of supplying carts (cf. XIII above). The reference to boiled rice (*siddh-anna*) in particular may suggest that unboiled rice had to be supplied. But the expression *siddh-anna* also reminds us of *sīdhā*, 'urcooked victuals', in Hindi, Bengali, etc.

XV. *Sarva-śreṇīnām=ek-āpaṇako na deyaḥ.*

Members of different guilds should not be allowed to flock to the same market. The idea seems to be that different mercantile guilds should occupy different markets or at least different quarters of the same market.

XVI. *Sarva-śreṇībhiḥ khovā-dānaṃ na dātavyam.*

All the guilds should not be compelled to pay *khovā*, the meaning of which is unknown. It may be the same thing as the *aṭṭapati-bhāga* or 'the share of the lord of the market' mentioned as a tax in the *Rajatarāṅgiṇī* (V. 164).

XVII. *Rajakule='dhikaraṇasya ca rāj-ārgghikā deya ; anyeṣam=adeya.*

Periodical offerings to be made to the king should be brought to the palace or to the particular office engaged in collecting them, but not to anybody else. *Raj-*

argghikā may be the same as *raja-pradeva* of the *Manusmṛiti* (VII. 119).²⁷ The word also occurs in XLVIII below.

XVIII. *Vārikasya haste nyāsako na sthāpanīyaḥ.*

This is probably related to XVII above. The offerings meant for the king were not to be deposited with (or, no deposits should be entrusted to) the *Vārika*. The *Vārika* (cf. LXXV below) seems to indicate a class of officials, three of which are mentioned in the record (cf. XXX, XXXI, XXXIV and L). It may be compared with Gujarati *Vāredār* or tax-gatherer. The *Bṛhaspatismṛti*²⁸ mentions *Vārika* along with the *cāturvidya*, *vaṇik*, *sarva-grāmīṇa*, *mahattara* and others, while the *Rajatarāṅgiṇī* (VI. 345) speaks of the *Kaṭaka-vārika*, the meaning of which is, however, not clear. The word may be connected with *vāra*, probably meaning 'the member of a committee' and occurring in such expressions as *vāra-goṣṭhī*, *pañca-vārī* and *vāra-pramukha* found in inscriptions.²⁹ But the official designation *Sānti-vārika*, occurring in the inscriptions of the Candra kings of Bengal, has been explained as 'probably a priest in charge of propitiatory ceremonies'³⁰ while Monier-Williams recognises the word *Nāga-vārika* in his Sans.-Eng. Dictionary and explains it as 'an elephant-driver or keeper' and 'the chief person in a court or assembly'.

XIX. *Para-viṣayāt=kāraṇ-abhyāgato vaṇijakaḥ para-reṣe na grāhyaḥ.*

The word *reṣa* means 'injury'; but its significance in the present context is unknown. The meaning of the *acāra* may be that a merchant belonging to another district or kingdom should not be accepted as a witness in a criminal case involving persons of a locality where he happened to be present on account of some reason or other.

XX. *Āvedanakena vinā utkrṣṭi na grāhyā.*

This seems to be related to XI etc., above; but the meaning of *utkrṣṭi* is unknown. *Āvedanaka* may indicate 'a formal complaint in court' and *utkrṣṭi* may be the same as Pali *ukkuṭṭhi* and Sanskrit *utkrūṣṭi*, *utkrośa*, meaning 'wailing'. A proper complaint, and not mere wailing, was acceptable to the court.

XXI. *Vākparuṣya daṇḍapāruṣyaḥ sākṣitve sārī na grāhyā.*

The *sārīka* bird could not be allowed to be a witness in cases of defamation and assault.

XXII. *Dhenku-kadḍhaka-nīla-dumphaś=ca viṣṭim na kārayitavyāḥ.*

The *dumphaś* of a *nīla-kuṭī*, liable to pay a certain tax, is also referred to in LI below; but who are actually exempted from forced labour (*viṣṭi*) in the present case cannot be determined. The words *dhenku*, *kadḍhaka* and *dumphaś* are unknown. *Dhenku* may be compared with Hindi *dhenkī* or *dhenkulī* meaning a machine for extracting juice, while *kadḍhaka* seems to be a Prakrit form of Sanskrit *karṣaka*. *Dumphaś* may be the same as Sanskrit *dumphaś* meaning 'one who presses'. The *nīla-dumphaś* possibly manufactured blue dye from the indigo plant. If *dhenku* is the same as

27. According to Manu, however, 'the headman of the village should get all of what is daily payable by the villagers to the king in the shape of food, drink, fuel and other things'. Cf. Sircar, *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas*, p. 187.

28. Cf. *Bṛhaspatismṛti*, G. O. S. ed., p. 159; *rājā kṣetram dattvā cāturvidya-vaṇig-vārika-sarva-grāmīṇa-mahattara-svāmipuruṣ-ādhiṣṭhitāṃ paricchinḍyāt*.

29. Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 138, note.

30. N. G. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III, pp. 8, 166.

Gujarati *dhikvo*, Hindi *dhenkli*, *dhenkul*, in the sense of the contrivance (based on the principle of lever) for drawing water from a well, the drawers of water for the irrigation of fields may be the persons indicated by *dhenku-kaddhaka*. cf. *karṣaka* in XXVII.

XXIII. *Prapāpūraka-gopālāḥ rāja-graheṇa na grāhyāḥ*.

Prapā-pūraka is a person entrusted with *prapā-pūraka*, i.e. 'filling the cisterns' with water in a place for watering cattle or supplying water to travellers. Such persons as well as the milkmen were not to be apprehended or recruited for free labour on the king's behalf.³¹

XXIV. *Grih-āpaṇa-sthitānām mudrā-patraka-dūtakaiḥ sāhasa-varjjam=āhvānam na karaṇīyam*.

Persons engaged in work at home or at their shops should not be summoned to court by means of a seal-ring or a letter or by a messenger, unless they are involved in a criminal case.³²

XXV. *Parēṇ=arth-abhiyuktānām vāda-pratisamāsane yajña-sattra-vivāh-ādīṣu āhvānam na kārayet*.

Persons engaged in such works as a sacrifice or a marriage ceremony should not be summoned to court to refute the charges brought against them. *Artha* may refer to an *artha-mūla* or civil (and not a *himsā-mūla* or criminal) suit.³³ Or, there may be reference here to two different sets of persons who should not be summoned, viz. (1) one engaged in *yajña*, etc.,³⁴ and (2) one already involved in another case.³⁵ A word like *niratānam* seems to be understood after *ādīṣu*.

XXVI. *Rṇ-ādān-ābhilekhita-vyavahāre a-kāṣṭha-loha-baddhena kṛta-pratibhuvā guptir=upāsya*.

In connection with a written complaint about the realisation of borrowed money, the debtor, when he was not under wooden or metal handcuffs because of security having been furnished for him by somebody, should enjoy the protection of the court. This seems to say that in the case of a debtor, for whom security had been furnished, neither handcuffs nor guards at court were necessary. When no *pratibhū* was furnished, the court had to arrange for the person's watch and the cost of it had to be borne by the parties.³⁶

XXVII. *Varṣāsu sva-viṣayāt bij-artham=āgataka-karṣakāḥ svāminā na grāhyāḥ*.

Cultivators coming out of their areas for sowing seeds during the rainy season were not to be apprehended or engaged by the king or landlord in free labour.³⁷

31. Cf. *Brhaspatismṛti*, p. 26 : *gavām pracāre gopālāḥ sasy-ārambhe kṛṣṇvalāḥ* in the section on *āhvāna* (summons) and in the list of the *n=āsedhyāḥ*.

32. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 24 : *mudrām dadyāt tathā patram puruṣam vā visarjayet*. See also P. V. Kane, *Kātyāyanasāroddhāra*, verse 88.

33. Vide *Kātyāyanasāroddhāra*, verse 108.

34. Cf. *Brhaspatismṛti*, p. 22 : *sattra-odvāh-odyato*, etc., in the list of the *n=āsedhyāḥ*.

35. Cf. *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, N. S. Press ed., p. 125 : *abhiyuktam ca n=ānyena*.

36. Cf. *ibid.* p. 126, quotation from *Kātyāyana* : *atha cet pratibhūr=n=āsti kārya-yogyas=tu vādinaḥ/ sa rakṣito dinasy=ānte dadyād=bhṛtyāya vetanam*||

37. Cf. *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, III. 11 : *a-grāhyāḥ karma-kāleṣu karṣakā rāja-puruṣās=ca*. See also *Brhaspatismṛti*, pp. 22, 26, and *Kātyāyanasāroddhāra*, verse 109.

XXVIII. *Āṣāḍha-māsi Pauṣe ca draṣṭavyam māna-pautavam; ādāne rūpakāḥ sa-pādaḥ saha dhārmikena.*

The *māna-pautava*,³⁸ which had to be examined in the months of *Āṣāḍha* and *Pauṣa*, seems to have been a store-house where grains were measured and stored. Possibly there were two kinds of store-houses, one working on a small fee and the other free of charges, there being no reduction of the tax ($1\frac{1}{4}$ *rūpakas*) for the later. *Ādāna* no doubt refers to the collection of tax, and *dhārmika* seems to point to an extraordinary case somehow associated with religious merit or, as suggested by LXVIII below, with permission or grace of the authorities. It is not possible to think that *dhārmika* was a cess collected by the king in the name of religion or some religious function in addition to the usual tax. The terms *ādāna* and *dhārmika* are frequently mentioned in the latter part of the document.

XXIX. *A-saṁvādya vyavaharataḥ śulka-ādikaḥ ca dhāny-ādi praveśayato niṣkāśayato vā śulkaḥ=aṣṭa-guṇam dāpyaḥ.*

It seems to be related to XXVIII above. If a storehouse collected fees and stored and disposed of grains without informing the royal officials, it had to pay eight times the usual tax, i.e. ten silver coins. This may also refer to the bringing and taking out of goods without official check-up in regard to matters of *śulka*, etc., as per the rules laid down.³⁹

XXX. *Peṭavika-vārikena pañca-rātrake pañca-rātrake kartavyam=arggha-nivedanam; anivedayato vinaye⁴⁰ rūpakāḥ ṣaḍ=dhārmike pādaḥ.*

The *Peṭavika-vārika* appears to be a particular class of *Vārika* or official that was responsible for the delivery of the *rāj-argghikā* received from the subjects once in five days. The word *peṭavika* is possibly associated with Marāṭhī *peṭhā* (sub-division of a Taluk) or *peṭh* (a trading town or an emporium). The fine for non-delivery was six silver coins; but, in the case of *dhārmika*, i.e. when there was any reasonable excuse, the fine was one-fourth silver coin. *Vinaya*⁴¹ means 'fine'. It is also possible that the *acāra* refers to the rule that, every five days, the official should fix prices (*arggha*) of commodities and inform the higher authorities about the prices so fixed.⁴²

XXXI. *Uttarakulika-vārikaiḥ māna-bhāṇḍa-meya-gate bahir=na gantavyam.*

Uttarakulika, like *Peṭavika*, possibly meant another class of *Vārika* or official. The *Uttarakulikas* appear to have been associated with the law-court. In cases of disputes in regard to the measurement, the measuring pot or the thing measured, such officers were possibly not allowed to go out of the court to be influenced by one party or the other.

38. For *pautava* (measures), *tulā-māna-pautava* and *pautav-āpacāra* (fraud in regard to measures), see *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, IV. 2 (cf. pp. 103-05 of the Mysore ed.).

39. See *ibid.* II. 23 (cf. Mysore ed., p. 112) on *niṣkrāma* and *praveśa*.

40. In similar contexts, the author uses both *vinaye* and *vinayaḥ* (cf. XXXIII below).

41. Cf. Nārada quoted in the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, p. 126.

42. Cf. *Manusmṛti*, VIII. 402: *pañca-rātre pañca-rātre pakṣe pakṣe= 'thava gate kurvita c=aiṣam pratyakṣam=arggha-saṁstāpanam nṛpaḥ*. See also *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, p. 270.

XXXII. *Uttarakulika-vārikāṇām=eva karaṇa-sannidhau Chātrena trir=āghuṣitānām nirupasthānād=vinaye rūpaka-dvayaṁ sa-pādaṁ saha dhārmikēṇa.*

Karaṇa apparently means *adhikaraṇa*, 'a law-court', and *Chātra* seems to indicate a peon or a constable. *Karaṇa* as a contraction of *adhikaraṇa* is found in the Midnapore plates of Śaśāṅka,⁴³ while the word *chātra* is used in the above sense in several inscriptions.⁴⁴ It seems that there was no excuse for the absence of the *Vārikas* of the *Uttarakulika* class when thrice summoned to court by a court peon. The fine for the offence was two and one-fourth silver coins even if there was any good reason for absence.

XXXIII. *Vyavahār-ābhilekhitaka-karaṇa-sevakasy=ā-madhyāhṇād=ūrdhvam nirupasthitasya vinayo rūpakāḥ ṣaṭ=sā-pādās=saha dhārmikēṇa.*

If the clerks who had to write down the statements of cases in the law court were absent from the court after midday, they were liable to a fine of six and one-fourth silver coins.

XXXIV. *Ā-madhyāhṇād=ūrdhvam=Uttarakulika-vārikāṇām chalo n=āsti.*

No pretext of the *Uttarakulika-vārikas*, absent from the court after mid-day, was to be accepted. For *chala*, see IX, X and XII above. The ordinary meaning of the word seems to suit the present context better.

XXXV. *Arggha-vañcane rūpaka-trayaṁ sa-pādaṁ saha dhārmikēṇa.*

This may refer to the *Peṭavika-vārikas* (cf. XXX above). In case of fraud in regard to the delivery of *rāj-argghikā*, the officers concerned were liable to a fine of three and one-fourth silver coins and the fine could not be reduced even when there was a reasonable excuse. *Arggha-vañcana* may, however, also refer to the flouting of the prices fixed by the authorities (cf. XXX above).

XXXVI. *Mudr-āpacāre vinaye rūpakāḥ ṣaṭ=sā-pādāḥ saha dhārmikēṇa.*

Mudr-āpacāra is the crime of using counterfeit coins (or, the misuse of official seals), the fine for which was six and one-fourth silver coins and no excuse for reduction of the fine was allowed.⁴⁶

XXXVII. *Sthāvara-vyavahāre sāmantaīḥ avasitasya vinayo rūpaka-śatam=aṣṭ-ottaram 108.*

Sāmanta possibly means a subordinate ruler (cf. XIV above). The meaning of the *ācāra* may be that a subordinate ruler was liable to pay a fine of 108 silver coins if he disposed of a case involving landed property without informing his overlord (cf. XXXVIII below). If the word *sāmanta* may be taken in the sense of men from neighbouring villages who had to settle boundary disputes,⁴⁷ the meaning of the *ācāra* may possibly be that the defeated party in a boundary dispute had to pay a fine of 108 silver coins. But the fine seems to be rather heavy for a case like this.

43. Vide *Prayāsi* (Bengali), Śrāvāṇa, B. S. 1350. pp. 291 ff.; *JRASB*, Letters, Vol. XI, 1945, pp. 8-9.

44. Cf. *Select Inscriptions*, p. 414 and note 5.

45. Cf. *adhikaraṇa-lekhaka*, 'an official recorder', in the *Rajataranginī*, VI. 38.

46. Vide *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, p. 268 (verse 24): *tulā-śaṣṭa-mānāṁ kṛtākṛn=nānakasya ca ebhiḥ=ca vyavahartā yaḥ sa dāpyo damam=uttamam* Cf. also quotation from *Kātyāyana*: *pramāṇena tu kṛteṇa mudrayā v=āpi kṛtāyā| kāryan=tu sādhyed=yo vai sa dāpyo dādam=uttamam*||

47. See *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, II. 152.

XXXVIII. *Sāmvadane rūpakāḥ catuṣpañcāśat.*

Taking *sāmanta* in the sense of a subordinate ruler (cf. XXXVII above), this seems to mean that the fine was only 54 silver coins (i.e. half the amount prescribed in XXXVII above), if information had been given to the overlord about the case. In case the alternative interpretation of the word *sāmanta* is preferred, the *ācāra* may refer to the party that had itself invited arbitration in a boundary dispute, but was defeated.

XXXIX. *Jayike bhāṣā ; phālāvane ca rūpaka-trayaṁ sa-pādam.*

This is probably connected with XXXVII-XXXVIII above. The *ācāra* is difficult to explain. But it may mean that the winning party (*jayika*) in a boundary dispute was to be granted a written declaration (*bhāṣā*) in its favour, although it had to pay 3½ silver coins for the protection of his ploughed field (*phālāvana*) from the encroachment of the defeated party in this dispute. We may also take *cā*, found in the original in place of *ca*, as a combination of *ca* and *ā*. In that case, *ā-rūpaka-trayaṁ sa-pādam* would mean 'any amount upto 3½ silver coins'.

XL. *Ullambane kaṛṇa-troṭane ca vinayo rūpakāḥ saptaviṁśatiḥ.*

The word *ullambana* is recognised in the lexicons in the sense of 'leaping over some one'; but the *Kaṭṭhīya Arthaśāstra*, IV. 8, uses it to indicate 'hanging' which may be applicable to the present case, although the punishment appears to be rather mild. *Kaṛṇa-troṭana*, i. e. 'cutting off of a bit from some one's ear', seems to be also referred to in X above. For these offences, the fine was 27 silver coins.

XLI. *Vākparūṣya-dandaparūṣyayoḥ vinaye rūpakāḥ ṣaṭ sapādāḥ*

The fine for the offences of defamation and assault (or, rough behaviour) was six and one-fourth silver coins.

XLII. *Kṣata-darśane rūpakāḥ aṣṭacatvāriṁśat.*

In the case of *danda-parūṣya* involving visible injury or infliction of wounds, the fine was 48 silver coins.⁴⁸

XLIII. *Gavāṁ tauṇḍika viṁśopakāḥ pañca.*

Five *viṁśopakas* were equal to one-fourth of a silver coin, a *viṁśopaka* being 1/20 of the standard silver money.⁴⁹ The meaning of *tauṇḍika* is 'biting of crops with the mouth'.⁵⁰ The offence involving *tauṇḍika* by cows caused a fine of five *viṁśopakas*.

XLIV. *Mahiṣyas=tad-dviguṇam.*

But the offence involving *tauṇḍika* by a she buffalo was ten *viṁśopakas*, i. e. one-half silver coin. Yājñavalkya prescribes four *māṣas* for the offence indicated in XLIII and eight *māṣas* for that in XLIV. Nārada, however, speaks of one *māṣa* and two *māṣas* respectively. The same authority regards *māṣa* as one-twentieth of the *paṇa* which is explained by Vijñāneśvara as the well-known copper coin of that name. Viṣṇu supports Yājñavalkya.

48. Cf. *Viṣṇusmṛti*, V. 66-67 : *ṣoṇitena vinā duḥkam=utpādayitā dvātriṁśat=paṇān ; saha ṣoṇitena catuḥṣaṣṭim.*

49. It is to be noted that, in LX below, five *viṁśopakas* have been separately indicated by the symbol for 1/4. This shows that five *viṁśopakas* were equal to 1/4 silver coin. Cf. D.R. Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, 1921, p. 210 ; Sircar, *Studies in Indian Coins*, pp. 299 ff.

50. Cf. Yājñavalkyasmṛti, II, 159 (see also Nārada quoted in the *Mitākṣarā*) ; Nāradasmṛti, XI, 31 ; *Viṣṇusmṛti*, V. 139 and 142.

XLV. *Madya-bhājanasy=āvalokye rūpakāḥ pañca.*

Āvalokya, derived from *avaloka*, seems to indicate 'detection'. If one was found out with a vessel full of wine distilled illegally, his fine was five silver coins.

XLVI. *Prathama-bhājane dhārmike adhikarāṇasya rūpaka-dvayaṁ s-ārdham rū° 2½.*

But, when it was the first offence and no bad motive could be substantiated, the fine to be paid to the court was only 2½ silver coins.

XLVII. *Anāpṛcchya sandhayato dvitiye=’hani tad-dviguṇaṁ dāpyaḥ.*

The first two words appear to mean *adhikarāṇam=anāpṛcchya rājapuruṣaiḥ sandhayataḥ*. This seems to say that, if a man, let off for the first offence, was caught with a vessel full of wine for the second time, his fine was double the amount prescribed in XLVI.

XLVIII. *Surā-karāṇasy=āvalokye rūpaka-trayaṁ; dhārmike rūpakāḥ sa-pādaḥ; rāj-ārghikayā madya-cāturtha-dvayaṁ 2.*

If one was caught while distilling liquor, his fine was three silver coins. But the fine was only 1½ silver coins if no bad motive could be substantiated, although two *cāturthas* (one *cāturtha* possibly being ¼ of the standard measure of liquids; cf. L and LXXIII below) of wine had to be paid as *rāj-ārghikā* (cf. XVII above).

XLIX. *Kāmsya-dosy-āyudhānām=Āśadhī-paurṇamāsī- bharolaka-nirodhena grahaṇaka-praviṣṭaṁ bhavati; grahaṇakeṣu daṇḍako n=āsusaraṇīyaḥ.*

This is apparently related to the distillation of wine which is the subject of XLVIII above and L below; but it is extremely difficult to explain the *ācāra*. The word *āyudha* may be taken in its old sense of 'a vessel'; but *dosya* is unknown although it may be a metal like *kāmsya* or bell-metal. It seems that the *bharolaka* (distillery?) was closed on the full moon day of *Āśadha* and the vessels (connected with the distillation of wine?) were put into the *grahaṇaka* (custody?); the *daṇḍaka* (rule about the supply of the royal share of wine?) was not to be followed when the distilling vessels were in the *grahaṇakas*. Alternatively it may be suggested that *kāmsya*=bronze utensils; *dosya*=clothes; *āyudha*=arms; *bharolaka*=store-house. If the king's share of the articles was not delivered by the producers by the full moon day of *Āśadha* (which was, according to Kautīlya, the last day of the financial year,⁵¹ then to such objects the law of mortgage (*grahaṇaka*) was applied, and they were subject to the payment of interest at the mortgage rate, but no fine (*daṇḍaka*); or such objects were confiscated and no fine was levied.

L. *Rājakīya-gaṇje Kalvapāla-vārikeṇa cāturtha-śoṭī-hastena meyaṁ muktva n=ānyat=kiṁcīt=karaṇīyam.*

The word *gaṇja* is used in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (IV. 589; VII. 125-26) in the sense of 'a treasury' 'a fund', but may be taken here to signify 'a store-house' as in the lexicons. The *Vārika* of the *Kalpavāla* community was apparently in charge of a store-house of wine. The word *kalvapāla* is no doubt the same as *kalyapāla* or *kalyāpala* found in the lexicons in the sense of 'a spirit-distiller.'⁵² It is also found in the form *kalpīla* in Viśvarūpa's commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (Vyavahāra, verse 50) and is the same as Prakrit *kallāla* and Hindi and Gujarati *kalāl*. *Śoṭī* seems

51. *Arthasastra* II. 7.

to mean a pot for measuring liquids like wine.⁵³ While measuring wine in *caturthas* or quarter-measures at the royal storehouse with the measuring pot in hand, the *Varika* or officer of the *Kalvapāla* community, was possibly not allowed to divert his attention to some other work. The word *caturtha* is also found in XLVIII above and LXXIII below.

LI. *Nilā-kuṭṭy-ādānaṁ dūmphakena deyaṁ rūpaka-trayaṁ rū° 3.*

Nilā-kuṭṭi may mean an indigo factory and *dūmphaka* (cf. XXII above) its owner or supervisor. The *dūmphaka* had to pay the tax of three silver coins for a *nilā-kuṭṭi*.

LII. *Ikṣu-vāṭ-ādānaṁ rūpakāḥ dvātriṁśat rū° 32 ; dhārmike rūpaka-dvayaṁ sa-pādam.*

The tax for a sugar-cane plantation was 32 silver coins ; but it was only 2½ silver coins if the field belonged to a religious establishment. The word *vāṭa* may have indicated a particular area of land.

LIII. *Alla-vāṭasy=āto=rdh-ādānam.*

The tax for an *alla-vāṭa* was half the amount prescribed in LII above. *Alla* is the Prakrit form of Sanskrit *ārdraka*, 'ginger'. and *alla-vāṭa* may possibly mean 'a ginger plantation'. It should, however, be noticed that the word *ārdraka* itself occurs in LXIII below. The word *alla* in Pali means 'moist' and *alla-vāṭa* may probably indicate 'low land'. But *ikṣu-vāṭa* in LII seems to suggest that *alla* was a produce like *ikṣu*.

LIV. *Yantra-kuṭṭy-ādānaṁ rūpaka-trayaṁ rū° 3 ; dhārmike rūpakāḥ sa-pādaḥ.*

Yantra-kuṭṭi may indicate an oil-mill or manufactory, for which the tax to be paid was three silver coins, although the tax was only 1½ silver coins if the productions were meant for a religious cause.

LV. *Varṣa-paryuṣitā vaṇijāḥ prāveśyaṁ śulka-ātiyātrikaṁ na dāpanīyāḥ ; nairgamikaṁ deyaṁ.*

Merchants staying abroad for a year were not to pay any entrance fee while returning to their native place ; but they had to pay the exit tax when they went out again on business. *Varṣa-paryuṣita* may also mean the merchant who takes up residence in the area for the rainy season only and not for the whole year, and *prāveśya* in such a case would mean 'immigration tax'. Trade was thus stopped in the rains. *Atiyātrika* is no doubt connected with *atiyātrā* used in the *Divyāvadāna*⁵⁴ in the sense of 'fare for crossing the boundary'. The *acāra* may refer to foreign merchants coming and staying in the kingdom for a year.

LVI. *Bhāṇḍa-bhṛta-vahitrasya śulka-ātiyātrike rūpakāḥ dvādaśa rū° 12 ; dhārmike rūpakāḥ sa-pādaḥ rū° 1½.*

For a boat (or, more probably, any large carriage or carrier) full of vessels probably of metal, the crossing fare was 12 silver coins; but, if the vessels were meant for any religious purpose, the tax was only 1½ silver coins.⁵⁵ It is difficult to determine

53. Cf. *soḷu*, *sauḷu*, *soṇṭige*, etc., meaning a specific liquid measure in some early Kannaḍa inscriptions, and *savaṭu* in modern Kannaḍa in the sense of 'a ladle'.

54. Ed. Cowell and Neil, p. 92, line 27.

55. Cf. the rates of customs duty for ferry crossing in the *Manusmṛti*, VIII. 403 ff., and *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, p. 274, with commentary thereon.

whether *bhāṇṇa* may here be taken in a general sense of manufactured articles or merchandise.

LVII. *Mahiṣ oṣṭra-bharakasya rūpakāḥ pañca sa-pādāḥ saha dhārmikena.*

For a boat (or carriage) full of buffaloes and camels, the tax was 5½ silver coins and there was no reduction even if they were meant for some religious cause. *Bharaka* seems to mean the same as *bhṛta-vahitra*. If *bharaka* may be taken in the sense of a load carried on the back of an animal (e. g., buffalo and camel), LVII, LIX, LXII and LXIII may not refer to a boat. The second interpretation seems to be more suitable in the case of LVII-LIX; cf. LXV.

LVIII. *Baliward-ādānam rūpaka-dvayaṁ s-ārdham rū° 2½; dhārmike pādāḥ ½.*

The tax for a load carried on the back of a bull was 2 silver coins; but, if it was meant for a religious cause, the tax was only ½ silver coin.

LIX. *Gardabha-bharak-ādāne rūpakāḥ sa-pādāḥ rū° 1½ saha dhārmikena.*

The tax for a load carried on the back of an ass was 1½ silver coins and there was no reduction even if it was meant for a religious cause. Cf. LVI-LVII above and LXIV below.

LX. *Ato=rdhena poṭṭalika-saṁkācitak-ādānam; avalambakasya viṁśopakāḥ pañca ¼.*

The tax for bundles suspended from a hanger carried by a person was half of 1½ silver coins and, for each hanger, the tax was five *viṁśopakas* or ¼ silver coin. The word *saṁkācitaka* is no doubt related to *kācita* used in the lexicons as an adjective; but, in LXXI below, it has been used as a noun possibly in the sense of 'a loop' (*kāca*). The same may also be the meaning in the present case.

LXI. *Pala-śatasya viṁśopakā-dvayaṁ saha dhārmikena.*

A bundle weighing 100 *palas* was taxed at two *viṁśopakas*.

LXII. *Yath-opari-likhita-bhaṇḍ-ādānāt dhānyasy=ārdh-ādānam.*

This seems to be related to LVI above. A carriage full of paddy (or, grains in general) was taxed at half the amount prescribed for a carriage full of vessels.

LXIII. *Ārdraka-lakṣāyāḥ śulka ātiyātrike rūpakāḥ sa-pādāḥ saha dhārmikena rū° 1½.*

The crossing fare for a carriage full of dried ginger sticks (*lakṣā*) was 1½ silver coins and there was no reduction even if the things were meant for a religious purpose. *Lakṣā* may also be the same as Hindi *lakṣī*. In that case, *ārdraka-lakṣā* would mean 'undried fire-wood'.

LXIV. *Vamśa-bhṛta-vahitrasya rūpakāḥ ṣaṭ sa-pādāḥ saha dhārmikena.*

The tax for a carriage full of bamboos was 6½ silver coins and there was no reduction even if the material was meant for a religious purpose. Cf. LVI, LVII and LIX above.

LXV. *Skandha-vāhyam dhānyam śulkaṁ na pradāpayet.*

There was no tax for paddy (or, grains in general) to be carried by a person on his shoulder.⁵⁶

56. Cf. *Nārada-smṛti* (ed. Jolly, p. 134): *skandha-vāhyam ca yad-dravyam na tad-yuktam (c-cūlkaṁ) pradāpayet.*

LXVI. *Kaṇikkā-kustumbarī-rājikā-prabhṛtīnām varṇikā-grahane setikā grahyā.*

Kaṇikkā is the Prakrit form of *kaṇikā* meaning 'cummin seed'. *Rājikā* is black mustard, while *kustumbarī* is the coriander seed. *Varṇikā* is Prakrit *vannīā* meaning 'sample', while *setikā*⁵⁷ (Prakrit *scia*, *seigā*) means the palm of the hand stretched out and hollowed and also a handful of things regarded as equivalent to two *palas* in weight. It seems therefore that only two handfuls of cummin seed, black mustard and coriander seed could be taken as sample by royal officials.

LXVII. *Vivāha-yajñ-otsava-simantonnayaneṣu ca śulkaṁ na pradāpayet.*

Ceremonies such as marriage were not to be taxed.⁵⁸

LXVIII. *Vara-yātrāyām śulka-ātiyātrike rūpakāḥ dvādaśa ; paṭṭaka-dhārmike rūpakāḥ sa-pādaḥ rū° 1½.*

If the procession of a bridegroom had to cross the boundary of the kingdom or district to reach the house of the bride, it had to pay the crossing fee of 12 silver coins ; but, if it was legalised by means of a *paṭṭaka* or passport, the fare was only 1½ silver coins. If *vara-yātrā* is taken in the sense of a public procession, *paṭṭaka-dhārmika* may refer to an authorised religious procession.

LXIX. *Madya-vahanakasya=adāne rūpakāḥ pañca rū° 5 ; dhārmike rūpakāḥ sa-pādaḥ rū° 1½.*

If a vehicle or boat full of wine had to cross the border, it was taxed at five silver coins, although the tax was reduced to 1½ silver coins if the wine was meant for a religious purpose.

LXX. *Khalla-bharakasya rūpakāḥ sa-pādaḥ saha dharmikena rū° 1½.*

The tax for a *khalla* (literally 'leather'; cf. Bengali-Hindi-Gujarati *khāl*) measure was only 1½ silver coins even if the material was required for a religious purpose. *Khalla* seems to mean here a leather vessel for carrying a liquid like wine which is mentioned in LXIX.

LXXI. *Kelāyāḥ saṁkacitakasya ca ato='rdh-ādānam.*

For a loop (cf. LX above) holding *kelā* and carried by a person by means of a hanger, the tax was half of 1½ silver coins prescribed in LXX above. The meaning of *kelā* is uncertain, although *kelā* in Hindi stands for Sanskrit *kadaḥ*. Can *kelā* in our record stand for a Prakrit form midway between *kilā* and *khelā* for Sanskrit *kṛīḍā* in the sense of *kṛīḍanaka* ? It may also mean a vessel for carrying wine, which was smaller than *khalla*.

LXXII. *Pada-ghaṭasya viṁśopakāḥ pañca saha dhārmikena.*

The tax for a *Pada-ghaṭa* was five *viṁśopakas*, i.e. ¼ silver coin, and it was not reduced even when the thing was meant for a religious cause. The word *paṭa-ghaṭa* possibly indicates a jar holding a quarter measure of wine.

LXXIII. *Kaṭu-madye śidhu-cāturtha-trayam 3.*

Three *cāturthas* or quarter measures (cf. XLVIII and L above) of the liquor called *śidhu* were regarded as the tax for very strong liquors.

57. Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, p. 235 and note 3.

58. Cf. the receipts of the office called *grha-kṛtya* in the *Rajatarāṅginī*, V. 157 ; VII. 42.

LXXIV. *Chimpaka-Kolika-Padakārāṇām yath-ānurūpa-karmaṇaḥ janapada-mūlyād=rājakulṣ=rdh-ādānam.*

The *Chimpakas*, *Kolikas* and *Padakāras*, who appear to have been followers of particular professions, possibly had to pay as tax half the money that would be the price of the things produced by them according to the rate prevalent in the land. *Kolika* may be the same as Sanskrit *kaulika* or a weaver and *Padakāra* may possibly be a shoe-maker. *Chimpaka* is Prakrit *chimpaya* (Gujarati *chipo*) meaning 'a dyer of clothes'. If *Padakāra* is the same as Hindi *paukār*, he was a retailer hawking his goods on foot.

LXXV. *Lohakāra-rathakāra-nāpita-kumbhakāra-prabhṛtinām Vārikena viṣṭiḥ karaṇīya.*

The blacksmiths, carpenters, barbers, potters and others could be recruited for forced labour under the supervision of the *Vārikas* or officers.

LXVI. *ye c=ānye pūrvva-valamānak-ācārās=te=pi mayā samanujñātaḥ.*

Besides the above, other customary privileges that may have been prevalent in the country from early times were also approved by the king.

LXXVII. *yato='nya-rājabhir=api asmad-vamśajair=anyair=vvā sāmānyam=ā-candr-ārka-ārṇava-graha-nakṣatra-kṣiti-sthiti-sama-kālinam putra-pautr-ānvayaṁ yaśaḥ-kīrtti-phalam=abhivāñchadbhir=idam=asmat-pradatt-ānugraha-sthiti-pātram=anumodanīyaṁ pratipalanīyaṁ c=eti||*

King Viṣṇuṣeṇa now requests the future rulers of the country, whether belonging to his own family or to other dynasties, for the favour of approving his grant of the privileges in favour of the merchants and to protect it for fame in this world and in the next (*yaśas* and *kīrtti*).

LXXVIII. *dūtako='tra sandhi-vigrah-ādhikaraṇ-ādhikṛta-Bhaḍḍakaḥ||*

The executor of the charter was Bhaḍḍaka who was a high officer of the ministry of war and peace.

LXXIX. *Sam 6° 4° 9 Śrāvaṇa-su 5||*

LXXX. *sva-hastāḥ śrī-Viṣṇuṣeṇasya||*

The date of the charter and the signature (*sva-hasta*) of the king put on the original document, later engraved on the plates, are here quoted.

The document is dated on the 5th day of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa in the year 649 and the endorsement, quoted below in LXXXIII, on the 7th day of the dark half of Kārttika in the year 357. Both the dates are expressed in symbols in accordance with the earlier fashion, instead of numerical figures of the decimal notation. We have to note that the year 357 refers to a date later than that indicated by the year 649, as, it will be clear from our discussion below, the endowment must be some year later than the document itself. Now, considering the palaeography of the document, the year 649 can only be referred to the Vikrama era and taken as corresponding to 592 A.D. This is also supported by the fact that the later date, year 357, which, considering the palaeography of the endorsement, can only be referred to the Traikūṭaka-Kalacuri-Cedi era or the Gupta-Valabhī era, corresponds either to 605 A.D. or to 676 A.D. This no doubt precludes the possibility of referring the year 649, when Viṣṇuṣeṇa issued his charter, to the Śaka era and taking it to correspond to 727 A.D. which would be later than 605 or 676 A.D. That the use of the Vikrama

era was not unknown in the Gujarat region, to which our record seems to belong, is suggested by the Dhiniki plates of Jāikadeva, dated Vikrama 794 (737 A.D.),⁵⁹ found in the Okhamandal District. The Vikrama-saṃvat seems to have penetrated into the region from Rajasthan where we notice its use in records dating from the third century A.D.⁶⁰ The use of the Vikrama era in the present inscription may possibly be explained by the suggestion that the merchants, in whose favour the document was issued, were accustomed to its use. It seems reasonable to think that the Jains, mostly a mercantile community, were greatly responsible for the development of the Vikrama and Śalivāhana-Śaka sagas as well as for the spread of both the Vikrama and Śaka eras.⁶¹

LXXXI. Svasi | Darpapurāt=sāmant-Āvantiḥ=kuśalī sarvvān=ev=atmiyān=anyānś=ca yathāsambadhyamānakān=bodhayaty=astu vo viditān yathā may=aitasya vaṇig-grāmasya Lohāṭakagrāma-pratīvasato y=eyam=uparilikhita sthiti-vyavasthā śrī-Viṣṇubhaṭeṇa dattā sā may=āpy=anumatā |

LXXXII. yata eṣām=uparilikhita sthiti-pātra vyavasthaya pratīvasatām svapanyena c=ātmānam varttayatām na kenacit=paripanthanā kāry=eti||

LXXXIII. Saṃ 300 50 7 Kārttika-ba 7 |

Now follows the endorsement referred to above, according to which Sāmanta Avanti issued an order from Darpapura to his own officials informing them that he had given his assent to the *sthiti-vyavasthā* granted by the illustrious Viṣṇubhaṭa (Viṣṇuṣeṇa) to the community of merchants residing at Lohāṭakagrāma (apparently the same as Lohāṭa, from where Viṣṇuṣeṇa's document had been issued) and that persons conducting their respective trades and following the above *sthiti-pātra-vyavasthā* should not be disturbed by anybody in any way. The endorsement ends with the second date referred to above. Whether Sāmanta Avanti was a subordinate of Mahāsāmanta-Mahārāja Viṣṇuṣeṇa (Viṣṇubhaṭa) or whether the Lohāṭa area came to form a part of the district ruled by Avanti at a later date cannot be satisfactorily determined. It is not improbable that Avanti belonged to the Gurjara clan of Gujarat, that dated documents in the Kalacuri era. If this suggestion may be accepted, the endorsement is to be regarded as dated in 605 A.D., only about 13 years later than the original document.

59. Bhandarkar. *op. cit.*, No. 17.

60. *Ibid.*, Nos. 1ff.

61. Cf. *The Age of Imperial Unity* (Hist. Cult. Ind. Peop., Vol. II), p. 114; *IHQ*, Vol. XXIX, p. 296.

CHAPTER IX

The Guptas in the Tiloyapaṇṇattī, Kaumudīmahotsava and Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa

I

The mighty fabric of the great empire of the Guptas, covering wide areas of Northern India, began to disintegrate about the close of the fifth century A.D. The Eran inscription¹ of the Gupta year 165 (484 A.D.) points to the hold of the Gupta emperor Budhagupta (477-95 A.D.) over East Malwa; but the Eran inscription of the Hūṇa king Toramāṇa (c. 500-15 A.D.), dated in his first regnal year, and the Gwalior inscription³ of his son Mihirakula (c. 515-35 A.D.), dated in his fifteenth regnal year, show that Malwa, both East and West, no longer formed parts of the Gupta empire. The Eran inscription⁴ of Bhānugupta, dated in the Gupta year 191 (510 A.D.), suggests that the Imperial Guptas succeeded in reconquering at least parts of East Malwa, while the Mūṇḍasor inscription⁵ of Yaśodharman (c. 525-35 A.D.), who claims to have defeated Mihirakula and established his suzerainty over areas which even the Guptas and the Hūṇas failed to subdue, suggests that West Malwa was lost to the Imperial Guptas permanently. About this time, the house of the so-called Later Guptas, who were apparently feudatories of the Imperial Guptas, began to grow powerful in East Malwa. The Maitrakas of Valabhī in Kathiawar (Gujarat) appear to have acknowledged Gupta supremacy as late as 502 A.D.,⁶ but gradually they began to rule without any reference to their Gupta overlords.⁷ This is, in short, the story of the secession of the westernmost provinces of the Gupta empire.

1. *Select Inscription*, pp. 335-36.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 396f.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 400ff.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 335-36.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 393ff.

6. Cf. the Bhambodra-Mohota plate of Dronasimha, dated in the Gupta year 183 (*ibid.*, pp. 403ff.).

7. The Maitrakas continued to use the Gupta era and also their subordinate titles, the first Maitraka king assuming imperial style being Dharasena IV who began to rule about 645 A.D. It is possible to think that, after the Guptas had lost contact with the western part of their empire, the Maitrakas owed nominal allegiance to the Hūṇas, the Aulikaras, the Kalacuris and others,

Of the former feudatories of the Gupta emperors, whose rise was hastening the downfall of the empire, the most prominent were, besides the Later Guptas of East Malwa, the Maukharis settled in U.P. and Bihar and the Gaudas originally of South-West Bengal. Of these, the Maukharis were associated with the heart of the Gupta empire and were apparently either responsible for or intimately connected with the overthrow of the Guptas from Bihar and U.P. The first Maukhari ruler to have assumed imperial title was Īśānavarman⁸ who is mentioned in the Haraha (Bara-Banki District, U.P.), inscription⁹ dated Vikrama 611 (553-54 A.D.), and the same inscription also mentions his son apparently as a subordinate ruler under him. The fragmentary Jaunpur (U.P.) inscription seems also to belong to the same king.¹⁰ These records prove that Gupta supremacy ceased to be acknowledged in U.P. by 554 A.D. But whether Bihar, in which lay the ancient city of Pāṭaliputra, capital of the Imperial Guptas, also formed a part of Īśānavarman's dominions by that time cannot be determined with precision.¹¹ The Haraha inscription speaks of Īśānavarman's victorious campaign with the Gaudas, while the Deo Baranark inscription and the Rohtasgarh seal-matrix point respectively to the occupation of the Shahabad District of Bihar about the last quarter of the sixth century first by the Maukhari kings Śarvavarman and Avantivarman, son and grandson of Īśānavarman, and then by *Mahāsāmanta* Śaśāṅka who later ascended the Gauḍa throne, but had been previously ruling Shahabad apparently as a viceroy of the contemporary Gauḍa monarch.¹² This may suggest that the Maukharis had ousted Gupta rule from Bihar which had been conquered from them by the Gaudas about the close of the sixth century. The evidence of the Deo Baranark inscription in regard to the Maukhari occupation of Bihar seems to be supported by the discovery of some earlier records¹³ of a branch of the Maukhari family in the Gaya District as well as by the Sirpur Lakṣmaṇa temple inscription¹⁴ of Śivagupta (*Mahāśivagupta*) Bālārjuna (seventh century) of the Pāṇḍu-varṇśa of South Kosala, which refers to a ruler named Sūryavarman, rightly identified with Maukhari Īśānavarman's son of the same name, as born in the Varman family that held sway over Magadha.¹⁵

8. Cf. Bhandarkar's List of inscriptions, Nos. 1602, etc.

9. *Ibid.*, No. 10.

10. *Ibid.*, No. 1601; *JRASB*, Letters, Vol. XI, p. 70; *JIH*, Vol. XLII, April, 1964, pp. 127ff.

11. Cf. *JRASB*, *op. cit.*, pp. 69ff.

12. Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 1554, 1741; *JRASB*, *loc. cit.*

13. Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 1603-05

14. See *Mahakosala Historical Society's Papers*, Vol. II, p. 19, verse 16.

15. Cf. *JRASB*, *op. cit.*, p. 72; *IHQ*, Vol. XIX, p. 277. The absence of any reference to the overlord of the chief Nandana in his Amauna (Gaya District, Bihar) plate of the Gupta year 232=551 A.D. (Bhandarkar's List No. 1310) may suggest a confusion in the political condition of Bihar resulting from the overthrow of the Imperial Guptas. Since the Haraha inscription, while describing the achievements of Maukhari Īśānavarman, speaks of his victory over the Gaudas, but of no conflict with the Imperial Guptas, it may be suggested that it was the Gaudas who ousted Gupta rule from Bihar, although they were soon driven out of that area by the Maukharis, and that Śaśāṅka's rule over the Shahabad District as a viceroy of the contemporary Gauḍa monarch during the earlier part of his life preceded the Maukhari occupation of Bihar. With the possibility of the continuation of the hold of the Guptas over Bengal and Orissa for sometime after their loss of Bihar, now suggested by epigraphic evidence, the above position seems to be untenable. It is difficult to believe that the Guptas continued to rule in the homeland of the Gaudas even after the latter had occupied Bihar.

H. C. Raychaudhuri¹⁶ draws our attention to the following Jain tradition recorded in Jinasena's *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (Chapter LX), composed in Śaka 705 (783 A.D.):¹⁷

*Guptānām ca śata-dvayam=ekatriṃśac=ca varṣaṇi/
kālaviddhir=udāhṛtaḥ //*

and points out that, if this tradition is to be believed, the Gupta empire collapsed 231 years after the start of the Gupta era in 319 or 320 A.D., that is to say, about 550 or 551 A.D. Raychaudhuri further says, "The supremacy over Āryāvarta then passed to the houses of Mukhara (c. 554 A.D.) and Puryabhūti (family of Harṣa, 606-47 A.D.) under whom the centre of political gravity shifted from Magadha to Kanauj and that neighbourhood."

In this connection it has to be remembered that there is epigraphic proof to show that the Imperial Guptas continued to hold North Bengal as late as the Gupta year 224 (543 A.D.),¹⁸ while there is no evidence in favour of Maukharī occupation of that region. We have to see whether it was the Gauḍas who overthrew Gupta rule from the eastern and south-western parts of Bengal. Inscriptions of the independent rulers, Dharmāditya, Gopacandra, Jayanāga and Samācāradeva show that they were ruling over the southern half of Bengal mostly in the sixth century.¹⁹ Of these, the *aditya* ending name of Dharmāditya may suggest that he was a scion of the Imperial Gupta family, though we cannot be sure on this point. Of the other three, at least Jayanāga is known to have had his capital at Kārṇasuvarṇa, well known as the capital of the Gauḍa kingdom at the beginning of the seventh century during the reign of Śaśāṅka (c. 600-25 A.D.), even though it is difficult to say whether he was a predecessor or successor of Śaśāṅka. It is very probable that the three rulers, viz., Gopacandra, Jayanāga and Samācāradeva, belonged to the Gauḍa clan and that it was the Gauḍas who ousted Imperial Gupta rule from North Bengal sometime after 543 A.D.²⁰ There is, however, no reason to believe that the Guptas were overthrown from U.P. by the Maukharis and from Bengal by the Gauḍas exactly at the same time, that is, about 550 or 551 A.D., the date suggested by Jinasena's *Harivaṃśa*. There is some evidence now to show that the final overthrow of the Imperial Guptas from Orissa and the adjoining areas of South-West Bengal must have taken place at a later date.

According to the recently published Sumandala (Ganjam District, Orissa) copper-plate inscription, Gupta suzerainty was acknowledged in the Ganjam region of Orissa as late as the Gupta year 250 (569 A.D.).²¹ The inscription records the grant of a piece of land in the Khallikot area of the Ganjam District in 569 A.D. by a chief named Dharmarāja who acknowledged the suzerainty of a king named Pṛthivī-vigraha-bhaṭṭāraka ruling over the Kālīṅga-rāṣṭra as a nominal feudatory of the Guptas. It is therefore fairly clear that the Imperial Guptas succeeded in maintaining their

16 *Political History of Ancient India*, 1950, pp. 626ff.

17 Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 495.

18 Cf. *Select Inscriptions*, 1942, pp. 337ff.

19 Cf. *ibid*, p. 351ff.; Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 1725, 1729.

20 Gauḍa occupation of North Bengal seems to be suggested by the *Aryamañjuśrīmīlaka* tradition regarding Śaśāṅka's association with the city of Pauṇḍra or Pauṇḍravardhana. See K. P. Jayaswal, *An Imperial History of India*, p. 50.

21 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 79-85. With the expression *Gupta-rājye varttamāne*, we may compare *Aṅgareja-rājye varttamāne* in the Masar inscription (Bhandarkar's List, No. 1068).

hold on parts of both Bengal and Orissa, at least of Orissa if not of Bengal, however precariously, till 569 A.D. After the loss of Bihar, they may have succeeded in retaining their control over Orissa from some base in Bengal. In this connection, another Jain tradition regarding the duration of Gupta rule appears to throw some welcome light.

The Jain work entitled *Tiloyapaṇṇattī* (*Trilokaprajñapti*) by Jāti-Vasaha (Yāti-Vṛṣabha) was published by Hiralal Jain and A. N. Upadhye. Stanza 1608 of this work has the following tradition regarding the duration of Gupta rule :—

tato Gutta tāṇaṃ rajje doṇi ya sayāṇi igitisā.

This tradition is the same as that recorded by Jinasena and says that the Guptas ruled for 231 years : but there is a different tradition on the same subject recorded elsewhere in the work. In stanzas 1503-04, we have the following in regard to the rule of the Śakas and the Guptas :—

*jādo ya Saga-ṇarimdo rajjāṃ vaṃsassa du-saya-badālā/
doṇi sadā paṇavaṇṇā Guttāṇaṃ //*

According to this tradition, the Śakas ruled for 242 years and the Guptas for 255 years. It has been rightly suggested²² that the statement about the Śaka rule lasting for 242 years is based on the fact that the year 242 of the Śaka era corresponded to year 1 of the era of the Imperial Guptas. But more interesting is the other statement about the rule of the Guptas lasting for 255 years. As the two traditions, viz., the one giving the duration of Gupta rule as 231 years (verse 1608) and the other speaking of 255 years (verses 1503-04) in place of 231, are found in the same work and are separated by a small gap of about a hundred stanzas, it is permissible to think that the author had in view two altogether different traditions on the same subject. It appears that the first of the two traditions relates to the extirpation of Gupta rule from their home province in U.P. and probably also in Bihar, while the second refers to the final overthrow of the Guptas from Orissa and probably a part of Bengal. If such was the case, we can assert on the strength of the *Tiloyapaṇṇattī* traditions that the first event took place about 50 A.D. and the second about 574 A.D.

We have seen how the evidence of Maukhari inscriptions points to the overthrow of the Guptas from U.P. before 553 A.D. That the suzerainty of the Imperial Guptas was ousted from Orissa about 574 A.D. seems also to be supported by epigraphic evidence. The Soro plate of Śambhuyaśis, dated in the Gupta year 260 (579 A.D.), is the earliest post-Gupta record pointing to the independence of Orissa from the yoke of the Guptas.²³ Reference in this connection may also be made to the Kanas (Puri District) plate²⁴ of the independent monarch Lokavigraha who was apparently a successor of Prthivīvigraha and granted a village situated in Dakṣiṇa-Tosalī (i.e. the Puri-Ganjam region) in the Gupta year 280 (699 A.D.). By this time, all vestiges of Gupta suzerainty in Orissa must have been a thing of the past. It is of course not known whether the independent rule of the Gaudas in Bengal also started from 574 A.D. But if such was the case, we have to assign the rule of Dharmāditya and Gopacandra

22. *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, Vol. III, No. 3, March, 1954, pp. 296-97.

23. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 201ff. ; Vol. XXVII, pp. 83-84. It may be that with the overthrow of the Guptas from Bengal, their Orissan feudatories became independent automatically.

24. *Ibid.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 323ff.

if not also Jayanāga and Samācāradeva, about the last quarter of the sixth century. Since, however, it is unknown whether king Dharmāditya belonged to the Gupta or Gauḍa dynasty and whether Jayanāga was a predecessor or successor of Śaśāṅka, it is probably better to assign the independence of the Gauḍas from Gupta yoke to a date earlier than 574 A.D.

With the decline of Gupta power in Orissa, the Mānas of the Balasore region and the Vighrahas of the Ganjam area were fighting for the supremacy over that country. This struggle of the Orissan powers among themselves gave an opportunity to the Gauḍas of Bengal to extend their suzerainty over Orissa during the reign of Śaśāṅka (c. 600-25 A.D.) and his immediate predecessors.²⁵ The conquest of Orissa by the Gauḍas may have been inspired by their feeling that they were the political successors of the Imperial Guptas in Eastern India.

The above discussion throws some light on the date of Jādī Vasabha's *Tiloyapaṇṇatti*. The work seems to have been composed considerably after 574 A.D. probably not earlier than the middle of the seventh century A.D.

II

The Andhra Historical Research Society at Rajahmundry earned the gratitude of the students of early Indian literature and history by publishing an interesting Sanskrit drama entitled *Kaumudīmahotsava*.²⁶ K. P. Jayaswal characterised the work as based on history and suggested that Caṇḍasena whose usurpation of the throne of Pāṭalipura is referred to in the drama should be identified with Candragupta I of the Imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha.²⁷

A careful study of the *Kaumudīmahotsava*, however, shows that the major part of the matter of this work is fictitious and that the identification of Caṇḍasena with Candragupta I is highly improbable. The said identification is invalidated not only by the different forms of the names, viz., *Caṇḍasena* and *Candragupta*, but also by the very plot of the drama. Excepting Caṇḍasena's relations with the Licchavis,²⁸ everything that has been said in the drama about Caṇḍasena goes against his identification with Candragupta I. We know that Candragupta was the founder of a dynasty which ruled for several centuries; Candasena of the drama, however, was merely a usurper of the throne of the Magadhan king Sundaravarman whose son, moreover, regained his father's throne when the usurper and the members of his family were killed.²⁹ We also know that Candragupta was born in a royal family: he was the son

25. *Ibid.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 328ff. Among the predecessors of Śaśāṅka, Gopacandra was formerly known to have ruled over territories including the Faridpur region of Central Bengal and the Burdwan area of Western Bengal. The recently published Jayrapur (Balasore District) plate of Gopacandra, however, shows that the Dandabhukti-maṇḍala (covering portions of Midnapore and Balasore) formed a part of his dominions. See *Select Inscriptions*, 2nd ed., pp. 530-31; *Indian Studies Past and Present*, Vol. VII, 1966, pp. 123ff. It is not as yet known whether the whole of coastal Orissa as far as Ganjam was included in Gopacandra's empire as it was in Śaśāṅka's dominions at a later date.

26. See Appendix to the Society's Journal, Vols. II and III.

27. See 'Historical Data in the Drama *Kaumudīmahotsava*', in *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XII, pp. 50ff.; *History of India*, pp. 113ff.

28. Cf. p. 30—*Caṇḍasena-katakaḥ . . . tataḥ svayaṁ Magadha-kulaṁ vyapadiśann=api Magadha-kula vairibhir=Mlecchair=Licchavibhiḥ saha sambandhaṁ kṛtvā latdh-ūvasaraḥ Kusumapuram=uparuddhavan.*

29. Cf. p. 36—*vats-ānubandho nihataḥ=Candasena-katakaḥ . . . unmūlita-Candasena-rāja-kulam . . . Kalyāṇavarmānam.*

of *Mahārāja* Ghaṭotkaca and grandson of *Mahārāja* Gupta; but the drama represents Candasena only as an upstart who was the adopted son of Sundaravarman, king of Magadha.³⁰

A passage in the speech of the *Sūtradhara*, which is supposed to prove that the drama was staged during the coronation of king Kalyāṇavarman and that the plot was taken from the past life of the king, it may be argued, proves the historical character of the *Kaumudimahotsava*.³¹ However, the drama was edited from a single manuscript and it is therefore not safe to accept the above reading and interpretation if the plot itself goes against the historicity of the drama. Before proceeding to discuss the historical value of the *Kaumudimahotsava*, it will be better if we give a summary of the plot.

Caṇḍasena, the adopted son of Sundaravarman, king of Pāṭaliputra, conspired with the Licchavis, the hereditary enemies of Magadha. The Licchavis besieged Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra, and in the contest with them, king Sundaravarman died on the battle-field. Then Caṇḍasena usurped the throne of Pāṭaliputra, and Kalyāṇavarman, son of the deceased Sundaravarman, was secretly removed to a fortified place called Vyādha-kiṣkindhā in the vicinity of the Pampā-saras,³² in the Vindhya, by Mantragupta who was a minister of the dead king. While Kalyāṇavarman was passing his days at Pampā, Mantragupta, always in disguise, was at Pāṭaliputra looking for an opportunity to regain the throne for the unfortunate prince. This is the background of the plot.

A nun named Yogasiddhi was originally the nurse of Kalyāṇavarman. After Sundaravarman's death, she left Pāṭaliputra, spent her days at several holy places, and at last reached Mathurā (capital of the Śūrasena janapada) where she was hospitably received by Kīrtisena, the Yādava king of Mathurā. Princess Kīrtimatī daughter of Kīrtisena, was entrusted to her care, and the princess was sent with her to Pampā to worship at the temple of the goddess Caṇḍikā, also called Vindhyaśasī, Bhavanī and Ekānāmśā,³³ the family deity of the Yādava royal line of Mathurā. At Pampā princess Kīrtimatī and prince Kalyāṇavarman met, and became deeply attracted to each other. Yogasiddhi saw a portrait of Kalyāṇavarman drawn by the princess and at once recognised the child who had been in her care at Pāṭaliputra. In the meantime, Mantragupta brought about the downfall of the usurper. Caṇḍasena and his family were uprooted, and Kalyāṇavarman was proclaimed as the king of Magadha. Yogasiddhi and Kīrtimatī went back to Mathurā, and Kīrtisena was pleased to learn all about his daughter's love affairs and her lover's fortune. He sent an embassy to Pāṭaliputra with proposals of his daughter's marriage

30. See p. 30—*purā kila Sundaravarmā svayam=avidita-svabhāvatayā viṣa-tarur=iva putrikṛtaś=Caṇḍasena-hatakaḥ*. Caṇḍasena may have been a Kṛśaka as suggested by Jayaswal. That he was of a low caste is known from the passage: *kutra idṛśa-varṇasya asya rāja-śrīḥ* (p. 30). The records of Prabhāvatigupta suggest that the *gotra* of the Guptas was Lhārāṇa. They had matrimonial relations with the illustrious ruling families of India like that of the Licchavis, Nāgas, Vākātakas and Kadāmbas.

31. See p. 1—*devasya Kalyāṇavarmanah prati-nava-rājya-lābha-saṁvarddhita-dṛṣṭi-vṛddhi-para-saṁkule='pi rāja-kule punar=ayam=aparah pratyasidati Kaumudimahotsav-ārambhaḥ... asy=aiva rājñah samatṛtaṁ caritam=adhikṛtya [Vijī]kaya nibaddham nāṭakam*.

32. See p. 3—... *abhitaś=Caṇḍik-nyatanam Pampā-sarah-samīpavartini... Vyādhakiṣkindhā-nāmni durga-sthāne... Kalyāṇavarmānam; p. 7—Vindhya-ādri-gandha-gaja-dāna-sugandh-ya='mī Pampā-sarah-salila-vīci-vimarda-sitāḥ...*

33. The reading *ekānāmśā* has been rightly corrected by A. Ghosh (*Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IV, p. 271).

with Kalyāṇavarman. Kīrtimatī was also sent to Pāṭaliputra. Kalyāṇavarman was glad to accept her as his queen.

It will be seen that major portion of the *Kaumudimahotsava* which claims to deal with the past life of Kalyāṇavarman is concerned with the prince's love affairs, and only a small part of it with his installation on the throne of Pāṭaliputra. Such matters may of course be imaginary even in a drama based on a historical theme. However, in a seemingly historical drama, we surely expect that at least princess Kīrtimatī (daughter of the Yādava king Kīrtisena of Mathurā), who is the heroine of the work and is, besides Kalyāṇavarman, the most important character in the drama, should be an historical figure. As regards Kīrtimatī and her father,³⁴ the drama says—*asti Śūraseno nāma janapadaḥ | tasya svāmī vikhyāta-kīrtiḥ Kīrtiseno devaḥ | ... tasya = eyam = ekā duhitā prāṇebhyo = 'pi garivasi Kīrtimatī nāma. svayam = eva duhitarām* "Candik-āyatanam gatvā kānicid = ahāny = āradhayatu bhagavatīm Vindhyavāsiniṁ = iti s ābhisarām = enām = itaḥ preṣitavān Yadunāthaḥ (p. 8) : bhagavatī = eva Vindhyavāsiniṁ kula-daivatam hi Yadunām = Ekānamśā (p. 38) ; tatas = tathā-bhūteṣu Vṛṣṇiṣu sāgara-grastāyām Gvaravatīyām pratiṣṭhāpita Parikṣitāḥ pravrajitu-kāmasya rājaraṣer = Yudhiṣṭhirasy = ādeśād = Dhanañjayena Śūraseneṣu pañc-ābhidhānam³⁵ Vṛṣṇi-kumāram pratiṣṭhāpayata hār-ālaṁkāro dattaḥ | tat paramparayā Kīrtisenam prāptaḥ (p. 45).

It is clear from the above passages that, according to the author of the drama, the Yādava family was ruling at Mathurā from the establishment of Vajra up to the time of Kīrtisena Yādava, father of Kīrtimatī. Now, Kīrtimatī may be supposed to be an historical character if only there existed a Yādava royal line at Mathurā about the time of Kalyāṇavarman who is supposed to have been a contemporary of Candragupta I and also of the author of the *Kaumudimahotsava*. The continuation of independent Yādava rule at Mathurā from Vajra to a king of the first half of the fourth century A.D. is, however, improbable. No Yādava king is known to have ruled at Mathurā, during the early centuries of the Christian era, from inscriptions and coins discovered in the region. We have coins of Indian Rājās and foreign Satraps³⁶ ruling in the Mathurā area; epigraphic evidence proves that Mathurā was first under the Śaka Satraps and then formed part of the Kuṣāṇa empire.³⁷ According to the Purāṇas,³⁸ seven Nāga kings ruled at Mathurā before it was conquered by the Guptas. So, the rule of a direct descendant of Vajra at Mathurā about the beginning of the fourth century A.D. seems to be out of question. The Yādava king Kīrtisena of the *Kaumudimahotsava* (if he is supposed to have been a contemporary of Candragupta I) is thus as imaginary as his daughter Kīrtimatī, and the major portion of the plot of the drama becomes unhistorical. Epigraphic evidence of about the eighth century, from Kama (Bharatpur District, Rajasthan), proves the rule of certain minor chiefs of the

34. Cf. the names Kīrtisena and Kīrtimatī which may be coined rather than genuine. Note also the fact that Pampā in the vicinity of Kiṣkindhā in the modern Bellary District, Mysore, is too far away from Mathurā in U. P. It is of course possible that some other Pampā in the Vindhyan region, not far from Mathurā, is meant, though it is difficult to say whether such a Pampā really existed.

35. Read *Vajr-ābhidhānam*. See *Garuḍapurāṇa*, I. 148.11; *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, V. 38.34; etc.

36. Smith, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, Vol. I, pp. 190ff.; Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 2nd ed., pp. 282ff.

37. Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, pp. 299, 301ff.

38. See *Vāyupurāṇa*, 99. 382.

Śūrasena family in the area near about Mathurā³⁹ It is difficult to connect Kirtisena of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* with the said chiefs. In case it is conjectured that the history of the Śūrasenas of the Kama region has its echo in the story of the drama, the composition of the work should probably be assigned to a date not earlier than the eighth century A.D.

However, since the existence of a Varman dynasty in Magadha is proved by inscriptional evidence and since the Licchavis are known to have had relations with Magadha from the time of Bimbisāra to that of Candragupta I, it may be supposed that there is some historical background of the play. But the said background does not help us in going beyond the conjecture that there was a Varman dynasty which may have ruled at Pāṭaliputra and that there was a Licchavi invasion of Magadha, possibly at the time of the Varmans. The Licchavis are known to have ruled in the northern part of Bihar and the adjoining districts now in Nepal from very early times to the ninth century A.D. It is, however, difficult to regard the names of Sundara-varman and Kalyāṇavarman as historical without any support regarding their existence from reliable evidence.

The Sirpur inscription⁴⁰ of Mahāśivagupta-Bālārjuna (son of Harṣagupta and Vasatā, and grandson of Candragupta) of the Pāṇḍava family is often ascribed to the eighth or ninth century A.D., but he may have really flourished in the first half of the seventh century. In this record, Mahāśivagupta's mother is said to have been the daughter of Sūryavarman of 'the Varman dynasty of Magadha'. There is thus evidence of the existence of a Varman dynasty in Magadha before the eighth century. One may suppose that Sūryavarman was related with Pūrṇavarman mentioned by Hiuen-tsang as a local Rājā of Magadha (about the middle of the seventh century) and as the last descendant of Aśoka Maurya. It is better, however, to regard Sūryavarman as the homonymous son of Maukharī Īśānavarman, so that 'the Varmans of Magadha' were the Maukharis whose names end in *varman*.⁴¹ It is possible that the author of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* echoes the rule of this Varman dynasty of Magadha which flourished after the decline of the Gupta dynasty, and not, as suggested by Jayaswal, to a dynasty that is supposed to have ruled at Pāṭaliputra before the Guptas. There is nothing to prove that the *Kaumudīmahotsava* is earlier than the seventh or eighth century A.D.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the drama mentions⁴² Kaṭāhanagara as a familiar and famous place, together with Kāñcī and other well-known Indian cities. This Kaṭāhanagara is no other than the celebrated city of Kaṭāha, identified with Kedah in the Malay Peninsula. Kaṭāha became famous in the eastern world with the ascendancy of the imperial dynasty of the Śailendras about the 8th century A.D. The Śailendra emperors are known to have had political relations with the Palas

39. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, pp. 34f.

40. Bhandarkar's List, No. 1654.

41. The Maukharis are known to have been in Magadha from early times (*Corp. Ins. Ind.*, Vol. III, Intro., p. 14)—although the evidence is doubtful. For the Maukhari occupation of Magadha about the sixth century A. D., see Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 1613-05, 2079-31, etc. Maukhari Īśānavarman's son Sūryavarman is known from the Haraha inscription of 553 A.D. (*Sel. Ins.*, 1965, pp. 385ff.).

42. See p. 37.

of Eastern India in the ninth century and with the Colas of Southern India in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.⁴³ This possibly explains why Kaṭāha figures prominently in medieval Indian works like the *Kaṭāhasaritsāgara*.⁴⁴

It may be pointed out that the *Vāmana*⁴⁵ and *Garuḍa*⁴⁶ *Purāṇas* mention Kaṭāha in the list of the nine divisions of Bhāratavarṣa in place of Saumya or Gāndharva mentioned in the other *Purāṇas* like the *Mārkaṇḍeya*,⁴⁷ *Viṣṇu*,⁴⁸ *Vāyu*,⁴⁹ *Brahmāṇḍa*,⁵⁰ etc. But it is interesting to note that Ptolemy (middle of the 2nd century A.D.) who gives a fairly detailed account of Malayasia,⁵¹ does not mention any name like Kaṭāha.⁵² It is therefore not impossible that the references to Kaṭāha in the *Vāmana* and *Garuḍa Purāṇas* are not earlier than the period when Kaṭāha became famous under the Śailendra emperors. The *Kaumudimahotsava* seems also to be a work of the same age.⁵³

III

A work entitled *Kṛṣṇacarita*, alleged to be a composition of the Gupta emperor Samudragupta, was published in 1941 by Rājavidya Paṇḍita Jivarama Kālidāsa from the Rāsāśālā Auśadhāśrama at Gondal in Kathiawar (Gujarat).⁵⁴ There is no doubt that the said work or at least its colophon attributing the authorship to Samudragupta is a recent forgery. It is a matter of regret that forgery is now a disturbing element in the progress of Indological studies.⁵⁵

In his *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, Madras, 1937, pp. cii-civ, M. Krishnamachariar quotes a passage said to be occurring in Chapter 3 of Bṛāga III of the *Kaliyugarājavṛttānta* Section of the *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa* which is apparently a forgery of recent times. The passage runs as follows :—

1. Candraśrī-Śātakarṇis=tu trīṇi varṣāni bhokṣyati/
Vāsiṣṭhaputra-nāmā tu khyāto yaś=ca bhaviṣyati//
2. Pulom=āpi tathā c=ānyas=samā sapta bhaviṣyati/
Ghaṭotkacasya putreṇa Candraguptena ṛālitah//
3. ete dvātrimśad=Āndhrās=tu bhokṣyante vasudhām=in ām/
śātāni pañca pūrṇāni teṣāṃ rājyaṃ bhaviṣyati//
4. teṣāṃ tu samsthite rājye bhūmir=Guptān gamiṣyati/
Śrīpārvatīy-Āndhra-bhṛtya ity=ākhyāṃ yānti ye nṛpāḥ//
5. atha śrī Candragupt-ākhyāḥ Pārvatīya-kul-odbhavaḥ/
Śrīpārvat-endr-ādhipateḥ putraḥ śrī-Gupta-bhūpateḥ//

43. R. C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, pp. 152ff., 167ff.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 51; *Kaṭāhasaritsāgara*, Taraṅga 13, verses 70ff.; Taraṅga 56, verses 54ff.; Taraṅga 61, verse 3; Taraṅga 123, verses 150ff., also verse 110.

45. XIII. 10-11.

46. *Pūrva-khaṇḍa*, 55. 4-5.

47. 57. 6.

48. Part II, 3. 6.

49. 45. 79.

50. 49. 13.

51. *Geography*, VII. ii.

52. *Alberuni's India* (trans. Sachau, Part I, p. 296) does not recognise the reading *Kaṭāha* in place of *Saumya* or *Gāndharva*.

53. The evidence of an old Tamil poem (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 170) which refers to Kalagam (identified by a later commentator with Kaṭāram, i.e. Kaṭāha) does not appear to take us much before the seventh century A.D.

54. See Sircar in *Pravāsī* (Bengali), Pausa, 1350 B. S. (December, 1943).

55. See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 435ff., for some forged inscriptions.

6. śrī-Ghaṭotkacaguptasya tanayo= 'mita-vikramah/
Kumāradevīm=udvāhya Nepāl-adhīśituḥ sutām//
7. labdha-praveśo rājye= 'smin Licchavīnām saḥāyataḥ/
Senādhyakṣa-padam prāpya nānā sainya-samanvitah//
8. Licchavīyām samudvāhya devyās= Candraśriyo= 'nujām/
Rāṣṭriya-syālako bhūtvā rājapatnyā ca coditaḥ//
9. Candraśriyam ghātayitvā miṣeṇ= aiva hi kenacit/
tat-putra-pratibhūve ca rājñya c= aiva niyojitaḥ//
10. varṣais= tu saptabhiḥ prāpta-rājyo vīr-āgrāṇī= asau/
tat-putram ca Pulomānam vinihatya nṛp-ārbhakam//
11. Āndhrebhyo Māgadham rājyam prasahy= āpahariṣyati/
Kacena tena putreṇa Licchavīyena samyutaḥ//
12. Vijayāditya-nāmnā tu sapta pālayitā samāḥ/
sva-nāmnā ca śakam tv= ekam sthāpayiṣyati bhūrale//
13. ekacchatraś= cakravartī putras= tasya mahāyaśāḥ/
Nepāl-ādhiśa-dauhitro Mleccha-sainyāḥ samāvṛtaḥ//
14. vañcakaṁ pitaram hatvā saha-putram sa-bāndhavam/
Aśokāditya-nāmnā tu prakhyāto jagatītale//
15. svayam vigata-śokaś= ca mātaram c= abhinandayan/
Samudragupto bhavitā sārvaḥśaumas= tataḥ param//
16. vijitya sakalām= urvīm Dharmaputra iv= āparah/
samāharann= Aśvamedham yathā-śāstram dvij-ottamāḥ//
17. sva-deśīyair= videśīyair= nṛpāḥ samabhipūjitaḥ/
śāstra-sāhitya-saṅgīta-rasikaḥ kavibhiḥ stutaḥ//
18. Samudraguptaḥ pṛthivīm catuḥśāgara-veṣṭitam/
pañcāśatam tathā c= aikam bhokṣyaty= ev= aikarāt samāḥ//
19. tasya putro= 'paraś= Candragupt-ākhyo vīra-keśarī/
Yavanāmś= ca tathā Hūṇān deśād= vidrāvayan balāt//
20. Vikramāditya-van= nityam paṇḍitāḥ parisēvitaḥ/
śruti-smṛti-purāṇ-etihāsa-kāvya-vicakṣaṇāḥ//
21. Vikramāditya ity= eva bhuvaneṣu pratham gataḥ/
sapta sindhūn samuttīrya Vāhlik-ādīn vijitya ca//
22. Surāṣṭra-deśa-paryantam kīrti-stambham samucchrayan/
ṣaṭtrimśad= bhokṣyati samās= tv-aikacchatrām vasundharām//
23. Kumāraguptas= tat-putro Dhruvādevī-samudbhavaḥ/
Kumāra iva dev-ārīn vijesyan= nija-vidviṣaḥ//
24. samāhart= Aśvamedhasya Mahendraditya-nāmataḥ/
catvāriṁśat= samā dve ca pṛthivīm pālayiṣyati//
25. Skandagupto= 'pi tat-putraḥ śakṣāt= Skanda iv= āparah/
Hūṇa-darpa-haraś= caṇḍaḥ Puṣyasena-nisūdanah//
26. Parākramāditya-nāmnā vikhyāto dharaṇītale/
śāṣyati mahīm kṛtsnām pañcaviṁśati-vatsarān//
27. tato Nṛsimhaguptaś= ca Balāditya iti śrutaḥ/
putraḥ Prakāśādityasya Śhiraguptasya bhūpateḥ//
28. niyuktaḥ sva-pitṛvyena Skandaguptena jīvata/
pitr= aiva śakam bhavitā catvāriṁśat samā nṛpāḥ//

29. anyah Kumāragupto='pi putras=tasya mahāyāsāh/
Kramāditya iti khyato Hūnair=yuddham samācaran//
30. vijity=Eśanavarm-ādīn Bhaṭārkeṇ=anusevitaḥ/
catuścatvāriṃśad=eva samā bhokṣyati medinīm//
31. ete praṇata-sāmantāḥ śrīmad-Gupta-kul-odbhavāḥ/
Śrīpārvatī-Āndhra-bhṛtya-nāmānās=cakravartinah//
32. Mahārājādhirāj-ādī-birud-āvaly-alaṅkṛtāḥ/
bhokṣyanti dve śate pañcacatvāriṃśac=ca vai samāh//
33. Magadhānām mahārājyaṁ chinnaṁ bhinnaṁ ca sarvaśaḥ/
sākam=etair=mahā-Gupta-vamśyair=yasyati samsthitiḥ//

It is unnecessary to discuss this fabricated account of Gupta history in its entirety, and a discussion of the sixth to the fourteenth stanza as quoted above will be enough. The details of the said verses may be summarised as follows. The son of Ghaṭotkacagupta (correctly, *Ghaṭotkaca*), i.e. Candragupta I, married Kumāradevī, daughter of the Licchavi king of Nepāla and sister-in-law of the Āndhra king Candraśrī of Magadha. He became at first the *Senādhyakṣa* of the Magadhan army with Licchavi help and then became the *Rāṣṭriya-syalaka*. He killed Candraśrī and, after seven years, also the latter's son Puloman. With the help of his son Kaca (correctly, *Kāca*), the Licchaviya, he extirpated Āndhra rule from Magadha which he ruled for seven years with the title *Vijayāditya*. He started a *śāka* (a medieval word meaning 'era') of his own. His son Samudragupta, son of the daughter of the king of Nepāla, became king with the title *Aśokāditya* after having killed his father and other relations with the help of the Mlecchas. The thirty-first stanza identifies the members of the Gupta dynasty with the Śrīpārvatīya Āndhras. The above details go clearly against many of the known facts of Gupta history. The Āndhras (Sātavāhanas) never ruled in Magadha; the Guptas were northerners having little dynastic connection with the southern Śrīpārvatīya Āndhras known from the genuine Purāṇas, and Candragupta I and Samudragupta were never known respectively as Vijayāditya and Aśokāditya. The South Indian bias makes the origin of the fabrication of the above account fairly clear.

A. S. Altekar rightly criticised the story about the Early Guptas alleged to be found in the *Kaliyugarājavṛttānta* section of the *Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa*.⁵⁶ The details of the story, most of which go against definitely known facts of Indian history, have been condemned as 'suspicious and late'. But Altekar says, "It is, however, not unlikely that in spite of the mixture of the doubtful traditions, the statement that Kāca was another son of Candragupta I may be true. A later interpolator is not likely to devise from his memory a name otherwise unknown to him and not current in his days."

Unfortunately, the whole passage is apparently a forgery which has to be assigned to a period later than the middle of the 19th century.⁵⁷ The person responsible for the fraud no doubt knew some details of Early Gupta history furnished by epigraphic and numismatic evidence and a few unwarranted conjectures of earlier researchers based on them. The passage seems to have been composed after researches in Gupta history, epigraphy and numismatics already passed its first stage; and there is some evidence to show that the section in question was fabricated shortly after the

56. *JNSI*, Vol. V, p. 36, note.

57. Cf. *ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 36. See R. C. Majumdar's valuable note in *IHQ*, Vol. XX, pp. 345 ff.

publication of Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions* (*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III) in 1888. The mention of the son of Kumāragupta I as 'Schiragupta' shows that the forgery was made on the basis of the Bhitari seal published by Hoernle in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. LVIII, Part I, 1889, p. 89, soon after the publication of Fleet's work, but before the appearance of Fleet's reading of the said name as 'Puragupta' in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XIX, 1890, p. 225. Of course it has now been found that the name is not Puragupta, but Pūrugupta. In this connection, it should be noted that no manuscript of the work with details of Gupta history has been noticed by any of the authors of the numerous Catalogues of Sanskrit manuscripts in different parts of the world.

It appears that the necessity of sticking to the name-ending Gupta was felt only after Candragupta I, son of Ghaṭotkaca (not Ghaṭotkacagupta), became an emperor; compare the analogous case of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal founded by Gopāla, son of Vapyata and grandson of Dayitaviṣṇu.⁵⁸ It is therefore not unlikely that the immediate successors of Candragupta I had originally names without the *gupta* ending. We know that Candragupta II was often called by his *priya-nāman* 'Devarāja'⁵⁹ (made *Devagupta* in later records belonging to the king's daughter's son Pravarasena II Vākātaka).⁶⁰ The original and popular name of Samudragupta may have been Kāca. It is a conjecture which appears to be less objectionable than others in the present state of our knowledge of Gupta epigraphy and numismatics. Amongst the names of the immediate successors of Gopāla of Bengal, notice has to be taken of Vikramaśīla (sometimes identified with Dharmapāla, son of Gopāla) and Hāravarṣa sometimes identified with Devapāla, son of Dharmapāla) which are without the *pāla* ending and are found in Abhinanda's *Ramacarita*.⁶¹ If it is believed that Samudragupta issued some coins under his precoronation name 'Kāca', there are some instances of the kind in Indian numismatics of the Mughul period. We know that Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān and Shāh 'Ālam issued some coins under their pre-coronation names Salīm, Khurram and Muazzam respectively.⁶²

In connection with the said passage of the *Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa*, it is necessary to add here that B.S. Upadhyaya of the Birla College, Pilani, carried on a correspondence with Krishnamachari from 1939 to 1941 with a view to find out the whereabouts of the manuscript of the *Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa* from which the latter had quoted the passage in his *History of Class. Sans. Literature*. On learning that it was lying with Krishnamachari himself at Tirupati, Upadhyaya intimated to him that he would visit that place to examine it. Krishnamachari then informed him that the particular pages in the manuscript were lost in the interval, and so he could not show them to him. Under these circumstances, it is not even impossible that the passage was concocted on the basis of Hoernle's article on the Bhitari seal not much earlier than the second quarter of the twentieth century. Thus B. Bhattacharya seeking to establish the historicity of the *Kaliyugarājavṛttānta* section of *Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa*,⁶³ P.L. Gupta relying on it to prove Kāca to have been a brother of Samudragupta,⁶⁴ and M. Rama Rao trying to prove the Śatavahana occupation of Pāṭaliputra immediately before the Guptas about the beginning of the fourth century A.D.,⁶⁵ have miserably groped in the dark.

58. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 423-24.

59. Sircar, *Sel. Ins.*, Vol. I, 1965, p. 281.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 444.

61. Cf. *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, ed. Majumdar, p. 123. See below, pp. 99ff.

62. Brown, *The Coins of India*, p. 97.

63. *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*, Vol. XXX, pp. 1-46; cf. *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, May, 1944, and Jagan Nath in *JBS*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 23 ff.

64. *JNSI*, Vol. V, 1943, pp. 43-44.

65. *Journal of Andhra History and Culture*, Vol. II, Part 2, 1944, pp. 82 ff.

CHAPTER X

Abhinanda, Bhavadeva and Puruṣottama

I

Sometime ago, S.P. Bhattacharya discussed the date of Abhinanda.¹ Bhattacharya said that Abhinanda was the author of the *Rāmacarita*, *Yogavāsiṣṭha-Rāmāyaṇa*, *Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra* and *Kadambarikathāsāra* and that Abhinanda was the son of Jayanta-bhaṭṭa, author of the *Nyāvamañjarī*.² He further pointed out that Abhinanda's *Yogavāsiṣṭha-Rāmāyaṇa* (Sthiti, XXXII. 11-19) contains a laudatory reference to king Yaśaskara of Kashmir, who, we know, ruled in the period 939-48 A.D. and that Jayanta-bhaṭṭa's *Nyāvamañjarī* similarly refers to the Kashmirian king Śaṅkaravarman who is known to have ruled in 883-902 A.D. Normally, therefore, it would appear that Jayanta-bhaṭṭa's active career has to be assigned to about the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century and that of his son Abhinanda to the first half of the tenth century. Bhattacharya explains away the epithet *Śātānandi*, 'son of Śātānanda', applied to Abhinanda in the *Rāmacarita* in his eagerness to identify the author of the *Rāmacarita* with Abhinanda, son of Jayanta-bhaṭṭa. He also tries rather unsuccessfully to explain away the importance of the references to Śaṅkaravarman and Yaśaskara and suggests that "Abhinanda flourished in and about 975 A.D. and might have come to his ancestral home about 1000 A.D. where, even during the declining days of Pāla rule, there was a patron king in the person of Yuvarāja-deva, panegyrised as Hāravarṣa Mahīpāla I." Thus he seems to identify Abhinanda's patron mentioned in the *Rāmacarita* with the Pāla king Mahīpāla I who ruled in c. 985-1035 A.D. But there is some evidence to show that the Pāla patron of Abhinanda, author of the *Rāmacarita*, flourished in the ninth century.

The *Rāmacarita* refers to the poet's patron as Hāravarṣa, Hāravarṣa-yuvarāja, Prthivīpāla, Yuvarāja-nareśvara, Vikramaśīla-nandana, Hāravarṣa-naralokapati, Pālakula candramas, Prthivīpāla, Pāla-kula-pradīpa, Bhīma-parākarma, Mahākavi-śrī-Yuvarājadeva, Pāla-tilaka Samrāt, Pālānām kul-endu Yuvarāja, Paracakrabhīma, Yuvarāja Pāla-vamśa-pradīpa, Śrī-Dharamapāla-kula-kairava-kānan-endu, Yuvarājadeva, Prthivīpati Vikramaśīla-janman, etc. Now, from the above references, it appears that the name of the *Rāmacarita* author's patron was Hāravarṣa, while Yuvarāja seems to be a secondary name of this ruler. As regards the name Yuvarāja, we have

1. *IHQ*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 201-12.

2. Cf. pp. 210-11.

expressions like *Yuvarāja-naveśvara* as well as the reference to a Pāla ruler named Yuvarāja as Abhinanda's patron in Sodḍhala's *Udayasundarikathā* composed in the eleventh century.³ Even if Yuvarāja may be taken in such expressions in the *Rāmacarita* to mean merely a crown-prince and heir-apparent, this meaning is no doubt irreconcilable with the description of the *Rāmacaritakāra*'s patron as *Pāla-tilaka Samrāt* in one case. The poet's date seems to preclude the possibility of his being so hopeless a *praśastikāra* as to represent a Yuvarāja as a *Samrāt*.⁴ But the difficulty is that we have no knowledge of a Pāla king of Bengal enjoying names like Hāravarṣa and Yuvarāja. The name-ending *varṣa* was popular among the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the name *Yuvarāja* among the Kalacuris. The Palas of Bengal, of course, often contracted matrimonial relations with these families. If the expression *Prthivīpāla* or *Prthivipala* is regarded as another personal name of Abhinanda's patron, we may no doubt point to names like Tribhuvanapāla and Mahīpāla (I and II) in the family of the Palas of Bengal. It should, however, be admitted that it is not easy to identify the *Rāmacaritakāra*'s patron satisfactorily from these considerations only. It is also not possible to suggest his date. The only point that is clear about him is that he was a descendant of Dharmapāla (c. 770-810 A.D.) as suggested by the expression *Dharmapāla-kula-kairava kānan-endu*. But Sodḍhala, who mentions both Abhinanda and his patron, flourished about 1026-60 A.D. as he was a contemporary of Śīlāhāra Chittarāja and Mummunirāja of the Konkan. It is also interesting to note that 'Sodḍhala in his chronology of famous poets of ancient India, beginning from Vālmiki down to his own time, places Abhinanda before Rājasekhara (who flourished in the first half of the tenth century).'⁵ It may be said therefore that Abhinanda was earlier than Sodḍhala (eleventh century) and probably also than Rājasekhara (tenth century). Thus he may be tentatively assigned to the ninth century. There is, moreover, some additional information deducible from one of the epithets of the ruler in the *Rāmacarita*.

The most important clue in regard to the identity of the *Rāmacaritakāra*'s patron seems to be his epithets *Vikramaśīla-janman* and *Vikramaśīla-nandana*, which show that he was the son of one Vikramaśīla. This is of course not incompatible with the other epithet *Dharmapāla-kula-kairava-kānan-endu*.⁶ Now the only Vikramaśīla in the Pāla family known to historians is Dharmapāla himself or his son Devapāla. According to Tibetan traditions, either Dharmapāla or Devapāla founded the Vikramaśīla monastery apparently named after himself on a hill situated on the bank of the Ganges.⁷ The same monastery is mentioned as *Vikramaśīladeva-vihāra* in a manuscript of the *Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* of the fifteenth regnal year of Gopāla II (c. 940-60 A.D.).⁸ Now we know only of two sons of Dharmapāla of the Pāla family of Bengal. They are Yuvarāja Tribhuvanapāla, who is mentioned in the Khalimpur

3. See Krishnamachariar, *Hist. Class. Sans. Lit.*, 1937, pp. 475-76; J.C. Ghosh in *ABORI*, Vol. XIII, pp. 197 ff.

4. Rājā Rājavallabha, the 18th century Zamindar of Rājanaḡira, (in the Dacca District Bangla lesh) has been called *Samrāt* in the *Rājaviḡaya-nāṭaka*. See *JAIH*, Vol. III, p. 392.

5. Cf. *Udayasundarikathā*, G.O.S., pp. xx f.

6. Cf. *Naiṣadhiya*, V. 124; *Suc. Sat.*, p. 258.

7. *Journal of the Buddhist Text Society* Calcutta, 1893, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 11, 17; *Tāranātha, Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien* (trans. Schiefner), p. 217; *Cordier, Catalogue*, Vol. III, pp. 321 f.

8. *JRAS*, 1910, pp. 150-51.

copper-plate inscription and possibly pre-deceased his father, and *Maharājādhirāja* Devapāla who ruled in 810-50 A.D. We also know that Devapāla's son Rājapāla was *Yuvarāja* during his rule. In the present state of our knowledge, it is difficult to say whether the *Rāmacarita*kāra's patron has to be identified with any of these sons of Dharmapāla or Devapāla or with an as yet unknown son and successor of either of those kings. Whatever may, however, be the exact identity of Vikramaśīla's son who was the patron of the *Rāmacarita*kāra, he must have flourished about the first half of the ninth century. Abhinanda, author of the *Rāmacarita*, therefore, can hardly be assigned to c. 975-1000 A.D.

It thus seems that, while the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha-Rāmāyaṇa* may have been a contemporary of the Kashmirian king Yaśaskara and lived in the tenth century, the *Rāmacarita*kāra Abhinanda, a son of Śātānanda, lived at the court of a son of Dharmapāla or Devapāla of Bengal in the ninth century. Abhinanda, son of Jayantabhaṭṭa, was the author of the *Kādambarikathāsāra* according to which his fifth ancestor Śaktisvāmin was a contemporary of the Kashmirian king Muktapīḍa (Lalitaditya) who flourished in c. 730-66 A.D. It is difficult to assign this Abhinanda to the days of Yaśaskara of Kashmir.

II

It is well known that the celebrated Bhaṭṭa-Bhavadeva, minister of king Harivarman (about the close of the 11th century) of East Bengal, was famous under the name Bāvalabhibhujāṅga. According to Bhavadeva's *praśasti*,⁹ composed by his friend, the Brāhmaṇa Vācaspati, the Savaṇṇa-gotrīya family, to which Bhavadeva belonged, lived in Siddhala-grāma in Rāḍha or Rāḍha in Āryāvarta. The grandfather of the great-great-grandfather of Bhavadeva received the grant of a village called Hastinibhiṭṭa from a king of Gauda. Bhavadeva's grandfather Ādideva was the minister for peace and war to the king of Vaṅga. Bhavadeva himself was also the *Sandhivigrahika* (minister for peace and war) to king Harivarman of Vaṅga and his son and successor whose name is not mentioned. Bhavadeva is described as a great exponent of the Brahm-ādvaita system of philosophy and as conversant with the writings of Bhaṭṭa-Kumārila. He was proficient in *siddhānta*, *tantra*, *ganita* and astronomical sciences and was an antagonist of heretic dialecticians including the Buddhists. Bhavadeva wrote treatises on the *horā-śāstra*, *smṛti* and *mīmāṃsā* philosophy. He was also well versed in such other subjects as *arthaśāstra*, *āyurveda*, *astraveda* and so forth. D.C. Bhattacharya published an account of Bhavadeva's works so far traced.¹⁰ These are the *Tautātita*matatīlaka, *Prayaścittaprakaraṇa*, *Sambandhaviveka*, *Karmānuṣṭhānapaddhati*, *Vyavaharatilaka*, *Nirṇayamṛta*, *Tithinirṇaya* and *Gandhaśāstra*.

Bhavadeva's other name Bāvalabhibhujāṅga is not only mentioned in his *praśasti* (verse 24, and line 25), but also in his works. As shown by Bhattacharya, the *Tautātita*matatīlaka (verse 23) has the following account about the origin of the name:

mām=adhyayana-daśayam=uvāca vācam darśi svapne |
 Bāvalabhibhujāṅga-āpara-nāmā tvam=asi Bhavadeva ||
 ten=āyam=udyamo me vidyā-darpān= na jātu samjātaḥ |
 tasmād=ih=avadhānam vidhatum=adhikurvate sudhiyaḥ ||

9. N.G. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III, pp. 25-41.

10. *Vaṅgīya Sahitya Pariṣat Patrikā*, Vol. LIII, Parts 3-4, pp. 96ff.; *IHQ*, Vol. XXII, pp. 127ff.

The word *darśi* or *darśī* in the text appears to be a mistake for *deśī*, i.e. *Deśika*, very probably used here in the sense of 'a teacher'. This passage thus shows that Bhavadeva received the name Bālavālabhībhujaṅga when he was a young student, probably from his teacher, although its meaning is not clear. That the meaning of Bālavālabhībhujaṅga was not intelligible even to medieval writers is clear from several authors quoted by Bhattacharya in his papers cited above. As the words *guptapāda* and *bhujaṅga* both mean 'a serpent', some writers identified Bhavadeva-Bālavālabhībhujaṅga with Abhinavagupta, often mentioned as Abhinavaguptapāda. Thus in the *Sārābodhinī* (commentary on Maṃmaṭa's *Kāvya-prakāśa*), Śrīvastalāñchana-bhaṭṭa-cārya says: *Abhinavaguptapāda iti ca tasya Bālavālabhībhujaṅga iti nāma*. Another commentator named Kamalākara-bhaṭṭa also says: *Abhinavaguptapāda iti Bālavālabhībhujaṅga-nāmno Bhavadevasya saṃjñā*. Bhīmasena-dīkṣita in his commentary entitled *Sudhāsāgara* goes one step further : *idam=atra rahasyam| purā kila kācit valabhi paṭhatām bahūnām Brāhmaṇa-bālānām=adhyayana-śālā āsīt| tatra paṭhan kaścīd=Gauḍa-balo='tisaubuddhyān=mukharatvāc=ca nikhila-bālānām bhaya-pradatvena Bāla-valabhi-bhujaṅga iti guruṇā vyapadiṣṭa| sa c=ācāryatām=upagata iti sakala-rahasy-ābhijñāh śrī-Vagdevat-āvatāro [Maṃmaṭo] gūḥyam tan-nāma Abhinavagopānāsi-guptapāda iti vaidagdhya-mukhen=ābhivyanakt=iti*. These interpretations of the name Bālavālabhībhujaṅga are palpably fantastic and far-fetched. But the story of the *Sudhāsāgara* that Bhavadeva received the name from his *guru* or teacher when he was a student reminds us of the tradition quoted above from Bhavadeva's own work.

Bālavālabhī is mentioned in the *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin as a city apparently in or about Rāḍha.¹¹ It was the capital of Vikramarāja who was a feudatory of the Pāla king Rāmapāla (c. 1085-1123 A.D.), a contemporary of Bhavadeva's patron Harivarman. Although the exact location of the city of Bālavālabhī has not yet been satisfactorily determined, it seems that Bhavadeva, an inhabitant of Siddhala-grāma in Rāḍha, was associated with the not-far-distant Bālavālabhī as a student. Bhavadeva thus appears to have been educated at a school in Bālavālabhī. Unfortunately the word *bhujaṅga* is never recognised in the sense of a student in Sanskrit lexicons, although it is quite established in the above sense in the Sanskrit or pseudo-Sanskrit of Malaysia and Indonesia.¹² The Javanese word *boejangga*=Sanskrit *bhujaṅga* commonly means 'a philologist, poet, literary councillor'. In old Javanese, it was used in the sense of 'an officially appointed professional scholar usually residing in or near the court'; but an older meaning of the word is believed to have been 'a pupil, disciple'. It has been suggested that the word *bujan* meaning 'neophyte' was Sanskritized as *bhujaṅga* meaning 'scholar'. Is it possible to suggest that the word *bhujaṅga* in Bhavadeva's name Bālavālabhībhujaṅga, which cannot be satisfactorily explained according to Sanskrit lexicons, was adopted in the sense of 'a pupil' from Javanese Sanskrit? Considering the close relations that existed between the Śailendras of Indonesia and Malaysia and the Indian ruling houses of the period in question, especially the Pālas of Bengal and the Colas of the Coromandel coast,¹³ the possibility can hardly be altogether ruled out.

11. Cf. *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, ed, R.C. Majumdar, p 157.

12. Cf. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 70, No. 2, April-June, 1950, pp. 73 ff.

13. Cf. Majumdar, *Śuvarṇadvīpa*, Part I, pp. 152 ff., 167 ff.

While disagreeing with the above suggestion regarding the interpretation of the title *Balavalabbībhujāṅga*, D. Sharma is inclined to interpret the expression *Balavalabbībhujāṅga* as 'the conqueror of *Balavalabbī*'.¹⁴ He suggests that Bhavadeva, who was a *Sandhivigrahika* of king Harivarman of Vikramapura, at sometime or other led his master's forces into *Balavalabbī* [in *Rāḍha*] and thus acquired the title *Balavalabbībhujāṅga*. Unfortunately this view has been offered without carefully considering all the difficulties involved.

According to Bhavadeva's own work entitled *Tautatitamatatilaka*, he received the title *Balavalabbībhujāṅga* when he was yet a young student at his school. The title is stated to have been conferred on Bhavadeva during his *adhyayana-daśa* probably by his teacher (cf. the *Sudhasāgara* tradition) as we have seen above. In any case, the fact can hardly be ignored that Bhavadeva himself connects his title with his student days. Sharma's suggestion would lead us to believe that Bhavadeva served as a minister of king Harivarman even before or during his *adhyayana-daśa*. Moreover, *Balavalabbī* was a quite small feudatory state not known from any other source excepting Sandhyākaranandin's *Ramacarita* and a distinguished minister of the mighty ruler of Vikramapura could hardly regard its conquest by him as a distinct achievement.

III

Some mediaeval works on Sanskrit and Prakrit grammar speak of a Buddhist grammarian named *Puruṣottamadeva*.¹⁵ The *Bhāṣāvr̥tti*, *Puruṣottamadeva's* gloss on *Pāṇini*, was commented on in the seventeenth century by the Bengali grammarian *Sr̥ṣṭidhara* in his *Arthaviv̥rti*. According to *Sr̥ṣṭidhara*, *Puruṣottama* wrote the *Bhāṣāvr̥tti* under the direction of king *Lakṣmaṇasena* who requested the author to omit the Vedic rules.¹⁶ Some scholars believe that this ruler is no other than the Sena king *Lakṣmaṇasena* of Bengal, who flourished in c. 1179-1206 A.D. They also suggest that the Buddhist grammarian *Puruṣottama* was a Bengali. The Bengali lexicographer *Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda* refers to *Puruṣottama's Bhāṣāvr̥tti* in his *Ṭikāsarvasva* which is a commentary on the *Amarakoṣa* and was composed in 1159 A.D. The *Bhāṣāvr̥tti* could not, therefore, have been composed by *Puruṣottama* later than the middle of the twelfth century. As the Sena king *Lakṣmaṇasena* ascended the throne two decades after the composition of the *Ṭikāsarvasva* and, for the matter of that, more than that period after the *Bhāṣāvr̥tti* had been written, it is suggested that *Puruṣottama's* work was composed when *Lakṣmaṇasena* was probably a provincial governor during the reign of his grandfather *Vijayasena* (c. 1097-1159 A.D.). The argument is no doubt not without force; but since it is inexplicable why the Sena prince *Lakṣmaṇasena*, who is known to have been much interested in the Vedic ritualistic writings, should have made the extraordinary request regarding the omission of the Vedic rules when such an omission is disapproved by orthodox Brahmanical tradition, the identification of this heretical *Lakṣmaṇasena*, patron of the author of the *Bhāṣāvr̥tti*, with the Sena ruler of that name appears to be unwarranted and the tradition itself appears to be doubtful. H. C. Raychaudhuri believes in the

14. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXVII, p. 339.

15. Vide *History of Bengal*, ed. R.C. Majumdar, Vol. I, pp. 358-60, and references cited therein.

16. Cf. *vaidika-prayog-ānarthino Lakṣmaṇasenasya rājña ājñayā*.

existence of a king named Lakṣmaṇasena belonging to the Buddhist Sena dynasty of Pīṭhī (Magadha) and takes him to be the founder of the Lakṣmaṇasena-saṁvat, the epoch of which falls about the first quarter of the twelfth century A.D. If this suggestion is accepted, it may be argued that the Buddhist grammarian Puruṣottama wrote his *Bhāṣavytti* at the court of this Buddhist Lakṣmaṇasena. Unfortunately, Raychaudhuri's suggestion is contradicted by the fact that Lakṣmaṇasena, founder of the era, is sometimes mentioned as 'the lord of Gauḍa'.¹⁷ A Prakrit grammar entitled *Prākṛtānuśāsana* by Puruṣottama, a manuscript of which is known to bear the date in the year 385 of the Newar era corresponding to 1264 A.D., is also attributed to the author of the *Bhāṣavytti*.

The medieval lexicons entitled *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, *Hārāvalī*, *Dvirūpakoṣa*, *Ekākṣara-koṣa*, etc., probably composed in Eastern India, are also known to be the works of Puruṣottamadeva. As most of these lexicons are found quoted in the *Ṭikāsarvasva* by Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda, they must have been composed earlier than 1159 A.D. According to many writers, the lexicographer Puruṣottama, author of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, *Hārāvalī* and other works, is no other than the grammarian of the same name who wrote the *Bhāṣavytti*, while others point out that the only grounds of the identity of the grammarian and the lexicographer are that both bore the same, but not an uncommon, name and that both were Buddhists. The identification of the author of the *Hārāvalī* with that of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* and the suggestion that their author was a Buddhist have, however, been usually accepted by writers on the subject.

That the author of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* was a Buddhist is indicated by the *maṅgala* at the beginning of the work. It runs as follows :

*jayanti santaḥ kuśalam prajānām
namo Munīndraya suvāḥ smṛtāḥ stha |
stut-āsi Vagdevi dayasva mātara=
vidhehi Vighnādhipa maṅgalani ||*

Thus the author begins with an adoration of the Munīndra which is a name of the Buddha according to the *Amarakoṣa*. The Deva-varga of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* also begins with the names of the Buddha, although this may be supposed to be in imitation of the *Amarakoṣa* of which the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* is avowedly a supplement. The adoration to the Munīndra or Buddha at the commencement of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, however, clearly shows that its author Puruṣottama was a Buddhist.

Curiously enough the *maṅgala* at the beginning of the *Hārāvalī* does not tally with that quoted above from the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*. It runs as follows :

*bhujaga-pati-vimukta-svaccha-nirmoka-vallī-
vilasitam=anukurvan yasya Gaṅgā-pravāhaḥ |
śirasi sarasa-bhāsvan-mālātī-dāma-lakṣmīm
laghayati hima-śauraḥ so='stu vaḥ sādhyā-siddhyai||*

Here the author begins his work with an adoration to the god Siva, and what is more important is that the names of the Buddha are altogether omitted from the Deva-varga of the *Hārāvalī* which, it may be pointed out, begins with the name of Siva. The author of the *Hārāvalī*, therefore, was not a Buddhist but a Śaiva.

17. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, p. 274.

It will be seen that Puruṣottama, author of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, was a Buddhist, while Puruṣottama, author of the *Hārāvali*, was a Śaiva. It is of course not definitely known whether the two works were composed by two different lexicographers who followed two different religious faiths, but bore the same name, or whether the same author named Puruṣottama wrote both the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* and the *Hārāvali*, the former when he was a Buddhist and the latter when he became a devotee of the god Śiva. But the first alternative seems to be preferable. Even if the identity of the author of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* and that of the *Hārāvali*, which is not altogether impossible, is accepted, it remains uncertain whether the lexicographer changed his faith from Buddhism to Śaivism or *vice versa*. It, however, seems probable that, if the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* and the *Hārāvali* were written by the same author, the lexicographer Puruṣottama was a Buddhist in the earlier part of his life and became a Śaiva later.

There is a tradition in Orissa that the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, *Hārāvali* and *Ekākṣaraakoṣa* were composed by the Sūryavamśī king Puruṣottamadeva (1470-97 A.D.) of Orissa in the fifteenth century.¹⁸ In support of this tradition, the following passage is often quoted from a work entitled *Kavicaṭita*, composed in Maharashtra probably in modern times : *Puruṣottamaḥ Kalinga-deśa-mahāpatih Śalivāhana-Śakābda-caturdaśa-sataka āsit | Kaṭak-abhidhānam nagaram ca tad-rājadhāni babhūva | sa ca Oḍiśa-kṣatriya āsit | ten=aiva Trikāṇḍaśeṣo Hārāvali Ekākṣaraakoṣa iti grantha-trayam sva-deśīya-pāṭhaśāl-opayuktam prāṇitam=ity=uktam=asti*. Some Oriya writers also suggest that the *maṅgala* at the beginning of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* is merely an adoration to all gods, which the Sūryavamśī king may have composed at the cosmopolitan temple of Jagannātha at Purī. The suggestions are, however, absolutely unwarranted. As the lexicons in question were quoted by Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda in 1159 A.D., their author Puruṣottama cannot be the same as the Sūryavamśī monarch of that name, who ascended the throne in 1467 or 1470 A.D. The *maṅgala* at the beginning of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, which does not refer to Viṣṇu at all, could hardly have been composed by king Puruṣottama of Orissa, who was a staunch devotee of the god Jagannātha (i.e. Viṣṇu). It cannot be ignored in this connection that the *Hārāvali* begins with an adoration to Siva and not to Viṣṇu. A manuscript of the *Ekākṣaraakoṣa* in the Bodleian Library gives the name of the author as Puruṣottamadevaśarman which would hardly suit a 'Kṣatriya of Orissa'. Numerous lexicographical works including the *Uṣmabheda*, *Jakārabheda*, *Śabdabhedaprakāśa*, etc., are attributed to Puruṣottama, a name probably claimed by different medieval lexicographers. The Sūryavamśī king Puruṣottama of Orissa may have actually been the author of one or a few of such works and this may have been responsible for the Oriya tradition identifying him with the author of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* and the *Hārāvali*. The tradition seems to have travelled to Maharashtra during the Marāṭha occupation of Orissa in the late medieval period.

18. Consult references cited in Mahapatra's paper in *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. II, Nos. 3-4, pp. 64ff.

The Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh, is a non-profit organization established in the year 2000. It is a registered society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. The foundation is dedicated to the preservation and digitalization of the Agamnigam manuscripts, which are a part of the rich cultural heritage of the Punjab region. The foundation has a team of experts who are working on the digitization of the manuscripts and making them available to the public. The foundation is also working on the preservation of the manuscripts in their original form. The foundation is a part of the Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh, which is a part of the Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh.

The Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh, is a non-profit organization established in the year 2000. It is a registered society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. The foundation is dedicated to the preservation and digitalization of the Agamnigam manuscripts, which are a part of the rich cultural heritage of the Punjab region. The foundation has a team of experts who are working on the digitization of the manuscripts and making them available to the public. The foundation is also working on the preservation of the manuscripts in their original form. The foundation is a part of the Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh, which is a part of the Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh.

CHAPTER XI

Chittapa's Praśasti of the Sun-god of Bhilsa

I

'Bhilsā' or 'Bhelsā' (24°N, 78°E), standing on the bank of the Betwa (ancient Vetravati), is the headquarters of a District of the same name in the old Gwalior State now forming a part of the State of Madhya Pradesh. Near it, on the opposite bank of the river, lies the village of Besnagar representing the ancient city of Vidiśā or Vaidiśā, capital of the Ākara or Daśarna *janapada*, roughly corresponding to East Malwa. As the principal city in this area, Vidiśā gave place to Bhilsa in the early medieval period. The old city retained some of its importance even in the post-Gupta period; but soon we notice the total eclipse of Vidiśā and the rise of Bhāyillasvāmin (also spelt *Bhāillasvāmin*, *Bhailasvāmin*) of which *Bhilsa* or *Bhelsā* is a later corruption. Bhayillasvāmin was originally the name of an image of the Sun-god worshipped in a great temple at the place which became gradually famous under the deity's name. The name 'Bhilsa' has not been changed to 'Vidisha'.

An inscription,¹ noticed by F.E. Hall at Bhilsa nearly a century ago, has the passage *Bhāillasvāmi-nāmā Ravir=avatu bhuvah svāminam Kṛṣṇarajam*. This shows that Bhāyillasvāmin was regarded as a representation of Ravi or the Sun-god and that the record was incised during the rule of king Kṛṣṇa who has been supposed to be the Rāṣtrakūṭa monarch Kṛṣṇa III (c. 939-68 A.D.).² Another inscription, discovered at Bhilsa and supposed to be written in characters of the tenth century, is stated to contain a eulogy of the said god.³ About 1030 A.D., Al-Bīrūnī mentions the city of Bhailsan (Bhāyillasvāmin) and places it on the road from Mathurā to Ujjayinī and Dhārā. He further says that it was 'a place most famous among the Hindus' and that 'the name of the town is identical with

1. See *JASB*, Vol. XXXI, 1862, p. 111; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 21, note.

2. An inscription (No. B 159 of 1952-53) in the Gwalior Museum seems to lend some colour to this identification. The epigraph, assignable to a date about the tenth century on palaeographical grounds, records the death of a warrior in a battle with the Karṇāṭas who may have been no other than the Rāṣtrakūṭas.

3. *Annual Report of the Archaeological Department, Gwalior State*, Samvat 1979, No. 25; Hariharnivas Dvivedi, *Gwalior Rājyake Abhilekh* (in Hindi), p. 101, No. 743.

4. Sachau, *Alberuni's India*, Part I, p. 202; cf. Elliot and Dowson, *History of India as told by its own Historians*, Vol. I, p. 59.

[that of] the idol worshipped there.' A charter⁵ of the Candella king Madanavarman, dated Vikrama 1190 (1133 A.D.), was issued from his camp near Bhailasvāmin, apparently meaning the deity in question, who seems to be also mentioned as 'Bhāsvat on the bank of the Mālava-nadī (Vetravatī)' in an earlier Candella record⁶ of Vikrama 1011 (954 A.D.). An inscription⁷ from Udaypur (founded by and named after Paramāra Udayāditya) in the Bhilsa District, dated Vikrama 1229 (1173 A.D.), speaks of the surrounding area as Bhāillasvāmi-mabādvadaśaka-maṇḍala (i.e. the district called Bhāillasvāmin consisting of twelve sub-divisions) which included Bhṛṅgarikā-catuḥṣaṣṭi-pathaka (i.e. a sub-district called Bhṛṅgarikā consisting of sixty-four villages) governed by a *Danda* (i.e. *Dandanāyaka*) probably having his headquarters at Udayapura (i.e. the findspot of the record). The name of the district was no doubt derived from that of its chief city which again assumed the name of the deity worshipped there.

In 1233 or 1234 A.D., Sultān Iltutmish of Delhi sent or led an army against Malwa and the Muhammadans 'took the fort and city of Bhīlsā or Bhīlasān'. While describing the said expedition, Minhājuddīn's *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri*⁸ says that, at Bhilsa, the Muhammadans destroyed a temple which was one hundred and five *gaz* in height. The same work seems to indicate that the temple was built three hundred years earlier thus referring its construction to a date about the tenth century. However, the glory of the god Bhāyillasvāmin did not totally eclipse with the demolition or desecration of his temple in 1233-34 A.D. But it was not destined to continue for a long time. According to Badāunī's *Muntakhab-ut-Tawārikh*,⁹ in 1292 A.D., during the reign of the Khaljī Sultān Jalāluddīn Fīrūz of Delhi, his nephew 'Alauddīn, governor of Karra, obtained permission 'to proceed to Bhīlsā and attacked that country and brought much booty thence to present to the Sultān, and the idol which was the object of worship of the Hindus he caused to be cast down in front of the gate of Badāun to be trampled upon by the people'. Thus ended the worship of the god at the city which received his name and is still continuing to enjoy it in its colloquial form.

In December 1952, we found in the Gwalior Museum the earliest among the known inscriptions mentioning the temple of Bhāyillasvāmin at Bhīlsā. It bears the date Vikrama 935, Vaiśākha-sudi 3. This date falls in 878 A.D.¹⁰

While putting up at the Dak Bungalow at Bhilsa in January, 1953, we had the opportunity of inspecting a number of antiquities gathered in the compound of the Dak Bungalow itself. As Bhilsa was once the famous seat of the Sun-god Bhāyillasvāmin, two stone inscriptions among the exhibits attracted our special attention. Both the records are mutilated; but an interesting fact about them is that they contain each a eulogy of the Sun-god. There is little doubt that the inscribed stone slabs were originally embedded in the walls of the Bhāyillasvāmin temple at Bhīlsā.

5. Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions, No. 231.

6. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 124 ff. (cf. *Mālava-nadī-tīra-sthiter*=*Bhāsvataḥ* in verse 45).

7. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 344 ff.

8. Elliot and Dowson, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 328; cf. Hodivala, *Studies in Indo-Muslim History*, p. 217; Raverty, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri*, trans., pp. 622-23.

9. Ranking's trans., Vol. I, p. 96.

10. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, pp. 211 ff.

The first of the two epigraphs is extremely damaged. The right hand side of the stone has broken away and the writing of the lower lines is completely obliterated. Of the first six or seven lines of the inscription, a few expressions only can be satisfactorily deciphered. Each of the lines contains about thirty *akṣaras* in a space about 17" in length. The characters are Nāgarī and the epigraph may be palaeographically assigned to a date about the eleventh century. The language of the record is Sanskrit. The inscription begins with one of the several forms of the *Siddham* symbol which is followed by the passage *Om namaḥ Sūryāya*. Then follow the stanzas in praise of the Sun-god. The first half of verse 1 in line 1 begins with the expression *Udayagiri* and seems to end with the word *viḥāya*. The second half of the stanza begins with *ambara-cūḍamaṇi*, the following letters of the line (line 1) being broken away and lost. Line 2 begins with the expression *anitā* possibly introducing the first or third foot of a different verse. The mention of *Udayagiri* and *ambara-cūḍamaṇi* in verse 1 suggests that the stanza speaks of the Sun-god. About the beginning of line 4, we have the word *javati*, while about the end of line 6 we can read *mohahara-dīpaka namas=te*. As the latter passage undoubtedly refers to the Sun-god and occurs in a stanza far removed from the beginning of the inscription, it seems that the whole record was a *praśasti* of the deity in question.

The other inscription is more interesting. In the *Quinquennial Administration Report of the Archaeological Department* of the old Gwalior State, it has been described as follows : " . . . a loose fragment picked up in the ruins is written in old Nāgarī script assignable to the 12th century A.D. on palaeographical grounds. This is broken at the top and left sides. It seems to have been a *praśasti* recording the merits of a distinguished personage, perhaps a king or a minister, who is compared to the Sun, but whom, unlike the Sun Rāhu could not hold in his grips. As the inscription is badly mutilated, its object cannot be made out. The *praśasti* was composed by *Mahākavīcakravartī Śrī-Dvittapa (?)* at the instance of *Daṇḍanāyaka Śrī-Candra*."¹¹ Elsewhere in the same work, while repeating the same views, it is said that the record 'does not convey any sense, nor any purport can be extracted from it.'¹² Unfortunately most of these statements are wrong. In the first place, the major part of the writing on the stone, mutilated though it is, can be satisfactorily deciphered. Secondly, the theme of the record is not the *praśasti* of a king or minister, but the *stuti* of the Sun-god. Thirdly, the name of the author of the eulogy is not *Dvittapa* but *Chittapa* who is fortunately well known from several sources. It may be pointed out in this connection that Dvivedi's *Gwalior Rājyake Abhilekh* (also a publication of the Archaeological Department of the former Gwalior State) contains a similar misleading note on the same inscription.¹³ Dvivedi quotes the poet's name quite confidently as *Dvitrāya* which is, however, even more erroneous. While the *Report* reads one of the three *akṣaras* of the name wrongly, Dvivedi's reading of all of them is wrong.

The piece of stone bearing the inscription is fairly big in size. The writing occupies only its upper part and covers an area about 38" in length and about 11.5" in height. The top and left sides of the inscribed stone have broken away. The

11. See *op. cit.*, Samvats 1998-2002 (1942-46 A.D.), pp. 1-2, 25.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 69, No. 2.

13. See *op. cit.*, p. 92, No. 666.

number of *akṣaras* lost at the beginning of the lines is about four in some cases, but slightly more in others. There are traces altogether of twelve lines of writing in the inscription; but the last line is less than half the other lines in length. Of the first line, only traces of the lower part of a few *akṣaras* at the end can be seen. It is impossible to determine whether one or more lines of writing are lost above this, although for the sake of convenience it may be regarded as line 1 of the original record. Many of the *akṣaras* in line 2 are also either completely or partially broken away. Even in the extant part of the epigraph, some letters here and there are more or less rubbed out.

The characters of the inscription are Nāgarī and may be assigned to a date about the eleventh century. The language of the record is Sanskrit. With the exception of a few passages at the end, the whole record is written in verse. The metre of all the stanzas is *Anuṣṭubh*. The record bears no date; but, as will be shown below, there is reason to assign it to a date in the eleventh century.

The inscription under discussion originally contained at least twenty-three stanzas in the *Anuṣṭubh* metre. They are all addressed to the Sun-god and the last of them speaks of the composition as a *stuti* (eulogy). Out of these, the text of ten stanzas (verses 6, 8-9, 11, 13, 15, 17-18, 20, 22) only have been fully deciphered. Of the remaining thirteen stanzas, two (verses 1-2) are completely lost, while the other eleven (verses 3-5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23) are partially preserved.

Verse 5 refers to the sage Agastya who is famous in the solar mythology of India not only as the son of Mitra (the Sun-god) and Varuṇa, but also as one who prevented Vindhya (the Vindhyan range) from his attempt to obstruct the Sun's passage in the sky. Verse 6 says how the Sun-god's youngest brother (i.e. Viṣṇu, the youngest of the twelve Ādityas including the Sun-god, according to some accounts)¹⁴ cut off the head of Rāhu, although the demon's life was spared as a result of his entreaty. Verse 8 represents the sun's rays as the source of the splendour of such objects as the jewel on the hood of Śeṣa-nāga, the pearls in the bed of the sea and the stars in the sky. The next stanza (verse 9) says that the sun's rays, when they come into contact with the moon, the horizon and the clouds, become respectively the moonlight, the twilight and the rainbow. In regard to the idea that the moonlight is nothing but the sun's rays reflected on the moon, it may be pointed out that it was fairly popular with ancient Indian writers.¹⁵ The Indian conception about this is made quite clear by Mallinātha in his commentary on the *Raghuvamśa*, III. 22 : *atra Varaha-saṁhitā vacanam 'salilamaye śaśini raver=diḍhitayo mūrcchitas=tamo naiṣaṁ kṣapayanti darpaṇ-odara-nihitā iva mandirasy=āntar'=iti; yathā darpaṇ-odara-nihitā ravi-diḍhitayas=tad-gatam=andhakāraṁ nāśayanti tathā svataḥ salilamaye candre taḥ pratiphalitā naiṣaṁ tamo ghnant=ity=arthah*. The other idea reflected in the verse in question, that the rainbow is produced by the sun's rays falling on the dripping clouds is also very interesting. Although it is supported by

14. See *Mahābhārata*, I. 123. 66-67; XIII. 150. 14-15; *Harivaṁśa*, I. 9. 48; *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, VI. 6. 39; etc.

15. Cf. *Raghuvamśa*, III. 22; Hayunthal plate (lines 24-25) of king Harjaravarman of Assam (*Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī*, p. 51); etc. P.C. Sen Gupta pointed out to us that the same idea can be traced in ancient Indian astronomical works such as Varāhamihira quoted in Pṛthūdaka's commentary on Brahmagupta's *Khaṇḍakhadyaka* (Chapter VIII), the *Sūryasiddhānta* quoted in the commentary of Utpala (966 A.D.) on Varāhamihira's *Brhatsaṁhitā*, etc.

modern scientific observation, it does not, however, appear to have been quite popular with ancient Indian writers.

Verse 11 illustrates the maxim *prema hi kuṭīla gatiḥ* (love's way is tortuous) by pointing out how Svarbhānu (i.e. Rāhu) prefers the moon to the sun in spite of the latter having his own name (Bhānu) and how the sun hides himself from the lotus [at night] in spite of the latter's attachment for him. Verses 18 and 20 are remarkable for their pleasant idea and sweet expression and are really worthy of a great poet. Verse 23 refers to the conclusion of the eulogy. Then follow references in prose to the author of the said eulogy, the person who was responsible for tracing the inscription on the stone and the devotee of the Sun-god who got the stone inscribed and apparently embedded it in a wall of the temple of the deity at Bhilsa. The eulogy is stated to have been the composition of the *Mahākavīcakravartin Paṇḍita śrī-Chittapa*. The name of the *lekhaka*, who traced the writing on the stone with a view to facilitating the work of the engraver, cannot unfortunately be made out. The person who got the eulogy written and the stone inscribed for embedding it in a wall of the Sun-god's temple was *Daṇḍanāyaka śrī-Candra*. We have seen above how a *Daṇḍa* (*Daṇḍanāyaka*) was probably in charge of a sub-division of the Bhāyillāsvāmin (Bhilsa) district according to an inscription of 1173 A.D. Candra of the inscription under study appears to have been a similar Sub-Divisional Officer of the Bhilsa region. He was apparently a devotee of the Sun-god of Bhilsa and got a eulogy of the deity composed by the poet Chittapa who may have been an inhabitant of the same area.

The inscription ends with the *akṣara cha* placed between double *daṇḍas*. This *cha* is really one of the many variants of the *Siddham* symbol.¹⁶ While at the beginning of records the symbol appears in several forms (variations of a sign resembling the modern Oriya 1 or 2 with the occasional addition, in the former variety, of a cipher below or at the right), at their end it is usually found in the form of *cha* or *tha* or a symbol standing midway between the forms of these two *akṣaras*.¹⁷

The importance of the inscription lies in the mention of the poet Chittapa, who enjoyed the title *Mahākavīcakravartin*, as the author of the *khaṇḍakāvya* in praise of the Sun-god, quoted in the record.

A number of stanzas of a poet named Chittapa are found in the Sanskrit anthologies and some other works. But no complete work of the poet has so far been discovered. The *pratikās* of all the stanzas attributed to Chittapa have been quoted in alphabetical order by F.W. Thomas in the excellent introduction of his edition of the *Kavindravacanāsamuccaya*.¹⁸ Unfortunately there was a confusion about the poet's name which is sometimes quoted also as Cīttapa, Chittipa, Chinnama and Chitrama. Moreover, stanzas attributed to this poet in some sources are assigned in others to 'an unknown author' (*kasy=āpi*) or to various authors such as Simhādatta,

16. Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVII, p. 352; *Proc. IHC*, 1939, pp. 471ff.

17. For *cha*, see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 140-41 (text lines 4 and 15); Vol. XXV, p. 63 (text line 94), p. 221 (text line 141); etc. See also *Naiṣadhiya* XVI. 93 (cf. *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Baroda, Vol. III, No. 4, June 1954, p. 36); Hemacandra's *Ekākṣarakoṣa*, v. 13; *Saṣṭakōṣa*, Poona, 1930, p. 74. For *tha*, see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVII, p. 293 (text line 30); Vol. XIX, p. 81 (text line 41). For the intermediate sign, see *ibid.*, Vol. XXIII, p. 80 (text line 35). The mark is sometimes found at the end of a stanza or the section of a record.

18. Published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1912, pp. 37-40. This is an incomplete copy of Vidyākara's *Subhāṣitaratnaḥ* now published in the Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 52, 1957.

Navakara, Dakṣiṇātya, Akalajalada and Hanumat or to such works as the *Bhoja-prabhandā*. Six stanzas of Chittapa are quoted in the *Sarasvatikanṭhābharāṇa* of the Paramāra king Bhoja (1000-55 A.D.), one in the *Kavīndravacanāsamuccaya* compiled before the end of the twelfth century, and forty-nine in the *Saduktikarnāmṛta* compiled by Śrīdharaḍāsa at the court of king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal in 1205-06 A.D. Poet Chittapa therefore could not have flourished much later than the middle of the eleventh century. The following stanza of the poet, quoted in the *Saduktikarnāmṛta* (III. 36), throws further light on his age :

*Valmikeḥ katamo='si kas=tvam=athavā Vyāsasya yen=aiṣa bhoḥ
ślāghyaḥ syāt=tava Bhoja-bhūpati-bhuja-stambha-stutāv=udyamah/
paṅguḥ parvatam=āruruḥṣasi vidhu-sparśam karen=ehase
dorbhyām sāgaram=ūttirṣasi yadi brūmah kim=atr=ottaram||*

This shows that Chittapa was a contemporary and probably a court poet of a king named Bhoja who has been indentified with the celebrated Paramāra monarch of that name. Thomas rightly says, "the rather numerous citations in the *Sarasvatikanṭhābharāṇa* are, therefore, by a contemporary." His ascription of Chittapa to the tenth century is, however, apparently due to oversight, as the poet must have flourished in the eleventh century when his contemporary and patron, Paramāra Bhoja, ruled. The title of *Mahākavicaḥkravartin* may have been conferred on Paṇḍita Chittapa by the same king. Possibly Chittapa was an eminent poet at Bhoja's court. The Bhilsa region is known to have formed a part of the dominions of the Paramāras. Chittapa's friend, *Daṇḍanāyaka* Candra, therefore, seems to have been an officer in the employment of Paramāra Bhoja.

Our inscription not only sets at rest the confusion regarding the poet's name, but also offers us the only *kāvya* of the author so far discovered. Its importance to the students of the history of Sanskrit literature is therefore inestimable.

TEXT

.
. //1
.
. //2
. grhṇāti t/
. myete vīta-ni trṣṇā-bhīno lilekha te //3
.
nūnam tejasvino='nyasya na tvam nām=āpi mṛṣyasi //4
Culuk-acānta-sapt-abdhir=Agastyo='nye='pi tadṛśah/
. rāga-vyājena bharttuṁ bbikṣām nu yācate //5
Rāhus=tvad-rociṣe druhyam=na batas=te='nujanmanā/
śīro lutv=āpi duṣṭe='rau yācanā-kauśalam hi tat //6
Tejas=tav=ārddram=ārddreṣu krūram krūreṣu jṛmbhate /
bhakt-ābhiprāva-nighnasya candra kṣate //7
Phaṇa-maṇiṣu Śeṣasya mukta-maṇiṣu toyadheḥ /
tārā-maṇiṣu ca vyomnas=tava rocir=vvirocate //8
Tava saṅkrāntam=enāṅke cakravāle payomuci /
jyotir=jyotsn=eti sandhy=eti suradhanv=eti gīyate //9
. te lakṣa-mada-rāgaḥ kapalayoh /

payodhara taṭe te = 'rccih prāṭicyāḥ kuṅkuma-dravaḥ //10
 Svarbhānuḥ = tvām na grhṇāti krīḍa-lolaḥ kalāvati /
 antarddhatse tvam = abjinyāḥ premṇo hi kuṭilā gatiḥ //11
 Na tath = onnidram = abj-āsyā . . . si padmīnīm /
 nūnaṁ vikatthano = 'rthena śabdena tvām Vikarttanah //12
 Dyām = āliṅg = abjinīm cumba śray = āpācīm vraj = ottarām /
 raja prācyām prāṭicyām vā dina-śrīs = tvān = na muñcati //13
 Prātar = hi rahasā yat tvām dina-lakṣmā . . . /
 rocamānaṁ punaḥ sā tvām = ahnām = ante = 'nugacchati //14
 Pūrvvam = utthīyate prātaḥ paścāt saṁviśyate niśi /
 aho sugrhiṇī-vṛttam = Uśasā te = 'nugrhyate //15
 Namas = tasmai prabhatāya . . . dyām sthirāyate /
 divam tvam = upagūhasi //16
 Kapola-bhittau svacchāyām sva-cchāyām tvām vilokayan /
 divo devyāś = cintayā tad = opāveśam viśaṅkase //17
 Kara-sparśe = 'pi te nātha dyaur = nnimilita-tārakā /
 y = āsau sarva-āṅga-saṅkrāntā na vidmaḥ kiṁ kariṣyati //18
 . . . candra-tādaṅkaḥ prācyām sandhy-āṁśukaṁ divaḥ /
 hriyate = h = oḍu-haraś = ca pūrṇa-pātraṁ tav = āgame //19
 Prācyām = udgacchato yātuḥ prāṭicīm śliṣyato divam /
 svadate nātha bahvīṣu pratipattiḥ priyāsu te //20
 grhṇāsi puṇyāni ca mahātmanām /
 na tathā sita-tejāmsi viyato = 'bhyudgate tvayi //21
 tamō bhettum yathā bāhyaṁ tath = āntaram = ap = īśiṣe /
 tav = odaye yathā rātris = tathā nidr = api naśyati //22
 Naro tma-guṇa-sampan-nunūṣayā /
 Ino = 'sy = Arkko = 'si Sūryo = 'si paryāpt = ety = eva te stutiḥ //23
 kṛtīr = iyaṁ mahākavi-cakravartī-paṇḍita-śrī-Cchittapasya /
 lekhaḥ maṅgalaṁ mahā śrīḥ //
 kārīr = eyaṁ daṇḍanāyaka-śrī-Candreṇa / cha //

II

We have mentioned above the earliest epigraphic record referring to the god Bhāyillasvāmin, which was found at Bhilsa and is dated in 878 A.D.

The inscription records the grant of an *akṣayanikā* made in favour of the *ayatana* or temple of the god Bhāyillasvāmin. The expression *akṣayanikā* is apparently a modification of *akṣaya-nivikā*¹⁹ which means 'a permanent endowment [providing a periodical income to be regularly and perpetually enjoyed by the donee]. The donor was a merchant of the Pāravāḍa²⁰ community (*jāti*). His name was Haṭiaka and that of his father Cacchiāka. It is stated that the grant was made by the libation of curds and water at the various *tirthas* or bathing *ghaṭs* of the locality. This reminds us of the fact that the inscription was actually found at Mahāghaṭ at Bhilsa. The inscribed stone seems to have been originally embedded in the stairs

19. Some early mediæval inscriptions of the Malwa region use the form *akṣayanīmī* or *akṣayanīmika* (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 160, 163).

20. This may be the same as the Por, Porwār or Porwāl caste, often called Prāgvāḍa-varṇa in inscriptions. See Bhandarkar's List, No 287 (cf. also No. 1523, etc.); Wilson's Glossary, s.v. *Porwal*.

of the *ghaṭ* in question. We know that grants were made in ancient India by the donor by pouring water in the donee's name or, when the latter was a person present to receive the donation, in the cavity of his folded hands.²¹ The mention of curds along with water in the same context in the inscription under review is interesting.

The endowment consisted of the income derived from three *vīthi*s. The word *vī kī* is used in Sanskrit literature in the sense of 'a market, a stall, or a shop in a market',²² although in some parts of ancient India it was often used in the sense of a territorial unit smaller than a district.²³ That the word *vīthi* in the inscription under review means 'a stall or shop in a market' is suggested by certain early medieval records of the Malwa region, incorporated in the Siyadoni (Jhansi District, U. P.) inscription.²⁴ *Vīthi*s are frequently mentioned in the record as lying in *haṭṭas* or market-places and as objects belonging to persons or deities, or gifts made in favour of deities worshipped in a local temple, or standing on the boundaries of other *vīthi*s. They are sometimes stated to have stood on the *haṭṭa-ra'hya* or market-road and often to have faced this or that direction. Some of the epithets (such as *ācchannā*, *avaliptā*, *kṛt-opasannā* and *uvāṭaka-sahitā*), applied to the *vīthi*s, are also used in the records in relation to houses. An *āvāsāṇikā* or house is stated to have been granted with all the rooms and *vīthi*s in it (*asy=ābhyantare samasta grha sametām samasta-vīthi-sametām*) and in this connection it is further said : *yah ko='pi vīthiṣu pravāsati sa=ca goṣṭhī-bhāvitam bhāṭakam dadāti dayādasya adhikāram n=āsti*. The reference to *bhāṭaka* (rent) for staying at the *vīthi* makes its nature fairly clear. As will be seen from our discussion below, the word *vīthi* has been used in the Siyadoni inscription and the record under discussion in exactly the same sense.

The first of the three *vīthi*s, the rent of which appears to have been assigned by the merchant *Haṭiāka* as an *ākṣayanīvīkā*, is described as follows : *vaṇig-Vuvāka-satka-vīthi bhog-ādhiṇā grhīta pa 13 (or 130) | sā ca mayā pradati=āgrahārah Nārāyaṇasya*.

The word *satka* is a Sanskritized form of Pali *santaka* and means 'belonging to'. The passage *bhog-ādhiṇā grhīta* seems to mean 'taken under possession'. This suggests that the *vīthi* in question was purchased by *Haṭiāka* from its owner *Vuvāka*. Unless such was the case, *Haṭiāka* could not have included its income in the *Ākṣayanīvīka* created by him.

The suggestion appears to be supported by the following grant recorded in the Siyadoni inscription : *śrī Viṣṇu-bhaṭṭarakasya vaṇik-Śrīdhareṇa Mahāditya-sutena vilepana-sammārijjana-pūjāpana - dhūpa-pradīpa - naivedy-ārtham śrīmad-Ādivarāha-drammasya pād-aikam pradattam | etad-arthe māsān=māsam pratidivamānam Pañciyaka-dramm-aikam śāsanam likhitam=aṅke paṁ dra eta'-arthe sā ca vīthi Naga-satkā dakṣiṇ ābhimukhā uvāṭaka-sahitā kṛt-cpasannā bhog ādhinā tiṣṭhati . . . asya vīthyā mocāpana-kāle apara-vīthi anurūpā śāsane likhāpya mokṭavyā*. The passage

21. Cf. *The Successors of the Sātavāhanas*, p. 192. The practice is still prevalent in some parts of the country.

22. Cf. *Ś. Sūpālavadha*, IX. 32.

23. N.G. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III, p. 71; *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, ed. R.C. Majumdar, p. 23.

24. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, pp. 173ff.

25. *Ibid.*, I, p. 178, text lines 37-38.

in corrupt Sanskrit quoted above seems to record the grant of a quarter Ādivarāha-dramma (a coin apparently named after Pratihara Bhoja I Ādivarāha, c. 835-85 A.D.) per month and, for this purpose, it appears to have been so arranged that a Pañciyaka-dramma (another coin possibly equal to a quarter Ādivarāha-dramma)²⁶ would be paid monthly out of the rent of a *vithi* belonging to Nāga, but made *bhog-ādhiṇa* [probably under a lease] by the donor who agreed that the said *vithi* could be taken away only after substituting another of its kind for it. In the inscription under study, what we have read as *pa* (followed by a number) and is apparently a contraction possibly stands for the coin called Pañciyaka-dramma which, as known from its mention in the Siyadoni inscription quoted above, was current in the Malwa region in the early medieval period. Thus our inscription seems to say that the *vithi* in question, which belonged to Vuvāka and fetched a monthly or annual rent of a number of Pañciyaka-drammas, was purchased by Haṭiāka and was granted by him as an *agrahāra* in favour of the god Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) worshipped in the Bhāyillasvāmin temple apparently as a subordinate deity. The custom of installing the images of various gods and goddesses in the temple (or in shrines built in the temple precincts) of a well-known deity is not only prevalent even today, but is also evidenced by numerous epigraphs including the Siyadoni inscription referred to above. The word *agrahāra* usually means an area of land granted in favour of Brāhmaṇas as a rent-free holding; but in inscriptions we have sometimes references to other kinds of *agrahāras* such as *Vaiśy-āgrahāra* (i. e. land given as a rent-free holding in favour of certain Vaiśyas).²⁷ In the record under study, the *vithi* in question was made what may be called a *dev-āgrahāra*. While the other two *vithis*, as will be shown below, were granted for the merit of the donor's parents, the first of the three *vithis* was probably granted for his own merit.

The second of the three *vithis* was situated at Khaharāsithī which seems to have been the name of a market place. Its rent was *pa* 50 (i.e. 50 Pañciyaka-drammas). The third *vithi* belonged to a person named Govinda. Its rent was *pa* 40 (i.e. 40 Pañciyaka-drammas). These two *vithis* were purchased by Haṭiāka who granted them in favour of the Mothers (i.e. the Mother-goddesses worshipped in the Bhāyillasvāmin temple or in shrines in its precincts) for the merit of his parents. The rent of the three *vithis* was expected to meet the expenses of the regular offerings (*niyata-bhoga*) to the god and goddesses in question. The intention of the donor seems to have been that the *vithis* themselves could be utilised (*samalahyāh*), probably implying their sale or mortgage at critical junctures (*sandhi-pāte*) or emergencies.

So long we had no definite evidence regarding the worship of the Sun-god at Bhilsa before the tenth century. The present inscription proves the existence of the temple of Bhāyillasvāmin as early as 878 A.D. In regard to the name of the god, it is possible to suggest that the deity was originally installed by and named after a person called Bhāyilla. Such a personal name is not unknown in the records of the Malwa

26. The word *dramma* was derived from the Greek *drachma* weighing originally 67.5 grains, although the Indo-Greeks adopted the modified standard of about 36 grains (Sircar, *Stud. Ind. Coins*, p. 362). The silver coins of the Ādivarāha type was single *Dramma* of 67.5 grains or Double *Dramma* (cf. Smith, *Cat. C. Ind. Mus.*, Vol. I, pp. 241f.; Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 301, note 2). The Pañciyaka-dramma seems to have been a much heavier copper coin like the Yaudheya *drammas* (cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 182, No. 18b.).

27. Cf. *JRAS*, 1952, p. 5.

region. An inscription²⁸ in the Gwalior Museum mentions one Bhāyilla-bhaṭṭa, although, as the epigraph is palaeographically assignable to a date about the ninth or tenth century, it is uncertain whether the person in question was named after the Sun-god of Bhilsa. That sometimes other representations of the god in different parts of the Malwa region were named after the famous deity of Bhilasa is possibly suggested by a Siyadoni epigraph (948 A.D.), which mentions a god named Bhāyillasvāmin installed in a temple of that locality by a merchant named Vikrama; but it is also possible to think that Bhāyillasvāmin of Siyadoni was named after another person called Bhāyilla. In the latter case, the Siyadoni Bhāyillasvāmin may not have represented the Sun-god. Bhāyilla-bhatta, mentioned in a Gwalior inscription³⁰ as a person, after whom the god Viṣṇu established in a local temple was called Bhāyillabhaṭṭasvāmin, may be a variant form of the same personal name.

The personal names Haṭṭāka and Cacchiāka, mentioned in the inscription, are really Haṭṭā and Cacchiā which have been made usable in Sanskrit by making them *akār-ānta* by suffixing the *svārthika-ka pratyaya* to them. Likewise, the name Vuvāka is actually Vuvā.

28. No. B 163 of 1952-53.

29. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. I, p. 177.

30. *Loc. cit.*

31. For the same name with variants, see also *ibid.*, p. 163; Bhandarkar's List Nos. 287, 1537; Cunningham's Reports, Vol. III, p. 43; etc.

CHAPTER XII

Introductory Part of a Kāvya

While dealing with the stone inscription containing portions of the Sanskrit drama entitled *Harakeli-nāṭaka*, composed by king Vighraharāja IV (1153-64 A.D.) of the Cāhamāna or Caubān dynasty of Śākambhaī, F. Kielhorn deplored the strange vicissitudes of fortune that led the stones, on which the royal author made the products of his muse known to the people, to 'have been used as common building material for a place of Muhammadan worship by the conquerors of his descendants'. Portions of the above drama as well as the *Lalitavighraharāja-nāṭaka*, composed in honour of the Cāhamāna king by his court poet, *Mahākavi* Somadeva, which were edited by Kielhorn,² were copied from stone slabs embedded in the walls of the Āḍhai-din-kā-Jhomṇḍā, a mosque situated on the lower slope of the Tārāgadh hill at Ajmer. The mosque, as is well known, was built out of the spoils of Hindu structures by Qutbuddīn Aibak (first Sultān of Delhi, 1206-10 A.D.) in 1200 A.D., while Sultān Iltutmish (1211-36 A.D.) subsequently beautified it with a screen.³ Impressions of another inscription on a stone slab from the same mosque were supplied to us by the Curator of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer. It appears that all these inscribed slabs had originally belonged to some temples or public buildings raised by the imperial Cāhamānas, the materials of which were later utilised in the construction of the Āḍhai-din-kā-Jhomṇḍā.

The impressions of the Ajmer (Āḍhai-din-kā-Jhomṇḍā) inscription, received by us, had a printed slip attached to them. It assigns the inscription to the twelfth century and mentions it as exhibit No. 256 of the Rajputana Museum. It further says, "This inscription forms the beginning of a Sanskrit poem engraved on slabs. It contains invocation to Nārāyaṇa and various other gods and states that the Caubāns belonged to the solar race." The description of the contents is, however, not strictly accurate.

The inscription under discussion covers a space nearly 4' 2" in length and 1' 9½" in height. There are altogether 27 lines of writing, each letter being a little above ½" in height. The engraving is neat and beautiful, although the stone is damaged in several places and some letters have broken away. As, however, the engraver is sometimes found to have avoided a damaged part of the stone, there is no doubt that the stone was defective in places even when the inscription was incised.

1. See *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XX, pp. 201ff. ; *Göttinger Festschrift*, 1901, pp. 16-30.
2. *Ind. Ant.*, *loc. cit.* ; *Göttinger Festschrift*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-15.
3. *Camb. His. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 581.

The palaeography and orthography of the inscription resemble closely those of other records of about the twelfth century found in the same area, and nothing calls for special mention. As the mosque, to which the inscribed stone belongs, is known to have been built in 1200 A.D. with the spoils of local structures, it is possible to attribute the date of the record to some time between the accession of the Cāhamāna king Ajayarāja (c. 1110-35 A.D.) who is credited⁴ with the foundation of Ajayameru, now known as Ajmer, and with beautifying it with many temples and palaces, and 1200 A.D. when the Ādhai-din-ka Jhompda was constructed, that is to say, somewhere in the middle or latter half of the twelfth century A.D.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit, and, with the exception of the passage *Om namo Nārāyaṇāya*||, preceded by the symbol for *Siddham* at the beginning, the whole record on the stone is written in verse. There are in all 37 stanzas, all of which, with the solitary exception of the last verse, are consecutively numbered. Considering the want of space at the end of the last verse and the fact that the poem was probably continued on other slabs, it seems that the number of the last verse (i.e., 37) was put at the beginning of the first line of another slab. As is the case with numerous other epigraphic records, a short space at the end of some lines in our inscription has often been covered by an unnecessary single or double *daṇḍa* usually endowed with a mark of cancellation.

Out of the 37 verses, which form the text of our record, the first 32 stanzas eulogise the god Viṣṇu. Ten out of these (viz., verses 12-21) refer to the incarnations of the god, viz. (1) Kūrma, (2) Mīna, (3) Kola (Varāha), (4) Nṛsiṃha, (5) Vāmana, (6) Jāmadagnya (Paraśurāma), (7) Daśāsyāntakṛit (Daśarathi Rāma), (8) Kṛṣṇa, (9) Buddha and (10) Kalkin. Verse 33 of the record introduces the Sun-god as the right eye of Lord Viṣṇu and as the progenitor of the solar dynasty which is itself introduced in the following stanza (verse 34). The next two stanzas (verses 35-36) speak of the glories of the solar dynasty and mention certain ancient rulers of the Sūrya-vamśa such as Ikṣvāku and Rāma. The concluding stanza (verse 37) introduces king Cāhamāna, mythical progenitor of the Cāhamāna or Cauhan clan of the Rajputs, as a scion of the solar dynasty. The nature of the inscription supports the conjecture that it formed part of the introduction of a *kāvya*, the theme of which may have been certain achievements of a Cāhamāna king. The principal one of these exploits described in the *kāvya* may have been the construction of a temple in honour of the god Viṣṇu.

The inscription is not of exceptional importance from the historical point of view; but it has considerable interest as a literary composition of a Cāhamāna court poet of the twelfth century. The author's style, although it is not free from defects, is not poor. He has often shown his skill in employing *śleṣa* or *double entendre*.⁵ In composing the 37 stanzas, he has employed no less than 14 metres, of which *Śardūlavikṛīṭita* (13 verses) and *Vasantatilakā* (8 verses) are used in more than half of the cases. The metres *Mālinī*, *Śikharinī*, *Anuṣṭubh* and *Upajāti* have each been used in 2 stanzas, while one stanza has been allotted to each of *Prthvī*, *Sragdharā*, *Vamśasthavila*, *Svāgatā*, *Harinī*, *Mandakrānta*, *Indravajrā* and *Upendravajrā*,

4. Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. II, p. 1071.

5. Cf. verses 5, 8-9, 11, 22-23, 25-26, 35.

As regards the eponymous Cāhamāna being represented as a scion of the solar dynasty, it may be pointed out that this is in partial agreement with the tradition recorded in the *Prthivīrājaviṇaya* of Jayanaka (12th century) and *Hammīra-mahākāvya* of Nayacandra (13th-14th century), according to which Cāhamāna sprang from the *Sūrya-maṇḍala*; but it can hardly be reconciled with the other imaginary accounts regarding the origin of the Cāhamānas, such as the creation of Cāhamāna himself or the Cāhamāna family by the sage Vatsa or Vasiṣṭha or by the god Indra.⁶ The well known story of the creation of the progenitors of the Paramāra, Cāhamāna, Pratihāra and Caulukya dynasties by the sage Vasiṣṭha on Mount Abu was of course not known to the Cāhamāra court poets as late as the fourteenth century.

The reference to Kṛṣṇa as the eighth of the ten *avatāras* of Viṣṇu is interesting. It is well known that the doctrine of the *avatāras* underwent several stages of development⁷ and that their number, originally unsettled, gradually came to be recognised as ten. It should, however, be noticed that even as late as the twelfth century, the same list of ten *avatāras* was not definitely fixed for the whole of India. Thus the author of the record under discussion, who was a twelfth century court poet of the Cāhamānas of Ajmer, regards Kṛṣṇa as the eighth incarnation of Viṣṇu, while the author of the Belava plate⁸ of king Bhojavarman (12th century) of Eastern Bengal recognises the same divinity merely as *aṁśakṛt-avatāra*, i.e., a partial incarnation. Another contemporary author, Jayadeva, who was a court poet of king Lakṣmaṇasena (c. 1179-1206 A.D.) of Bengal puts Haladhara (i.e., Balarāma-Saṅkarṣaṇa) in the place of Kṛṣṇa as the eighth incarnation of Viṣṇu in the list of the ten *avatāras* in the *Gita-govinda*.⁹

TEXT¹⁰

Siddham symbol// Om namo Nārāyaṇāya//
 Ārādhanīyam=amarair=api pātu yuṣmān
 pād-āravinda-yugalaṁ Garuḍadhvajasya/
 vinyasta-kaustubhamaṇer=uraso='varuhya
 Lakṣmīr=nakh-aṁśu-khacitaṁ bhajate bhṛṣaṁ yat //1
 Jagaj-janana-pālana-pralaya-keli-kāro muhur=
 mahā-danuja-rākināṁ vibhita-nigraha-ānugrahaḥ /
 Vibhāṁgapatī-vābano bhujagarāja-talpe-śayah
 śriye bhavatu vo bhav-āmbunidhi-karṇadhāro Hariḥ //2
 Ōṅkāro dānava-śtrī-samudaya-rudita-brahma-pārāyaṇānāṁ
 kalp-ānt-ārabdha-tāra-stanita-jaladhara-śreṇi-śaky-ānukāraḥ /
 pāp-āhi-kṣveda-pīḍa-nipatita-sukṛt-otthāpan-āmogha-mantro

6. Ray, *op. cit.*, p. 1053. cf. Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kāśikindhā*, pp. 17 ff.
7. See Sircar in *The History and Culture of Indian People*, Vol. III (*The Classical Age*), ed. Majumdar, pp. 414ff. See also Sircar, *Stud. Rel. L. Anc. Med. Ind.*, pp. 41 ff.
8. N.G. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III, pp. 14ff.
9. Verse 12. Jayadeva's list of the *avatāras* corresponds to that given in a Purāṇic verse quoted in an eighth century inscription from Māmallaṇḍapuram (*Mem. ASI*, No. 26, p. 5).
10. Metres : verse 1 *Vasantatilakā* ; verse 2 *Prthivī*, verse 3 *Sragdharā*; verses 4-5 *Sārdūlavikṛīḍita*; verse 6 *Vasantatilakā* ; verse 7 *Malinī*; verses 8-9 *Vasantatilakā* ; verse 10 *Sārdūlavikṛīḍita* ; verse 11 *Vaṁśasthaviḷā* ; verses 12-13 *Vasantatilakā* ; verses 14-16 *Sārdūlavikṛīḍita* ; verse 17 *Malinī* ; verses 18-19 *Sārdūlavikṛīḍita* ; verse 20 *Vasantatilakā* ; verse 21 *Sārdūlavikṛīḍita* ; verse 22 *Sikharinī* ; verse 23 *Anuṣṭubh* ; verse 24 *Svāgatā* ; verse 25 *Sikharinī* ; verse 26 *Uṇḍravajrā* ; verse 27 *Harinī* ; verse 28 *Māṇḍākrāntā* ; verse 29 *Indravajrā* ; verses 30-31 *Sārdūlavikṛīḍita* ; verses 32-33 *Uṇḍravajrā* ; verses 34-35 *Upajāti*.

jīyād=yuddheṣu sa Śrī-sahacara-Murajit-pāñcājanya-pranādaḥ //3
 Murdhni Śrī-kuca-kumbhayor=nipatitā mukta kalāpāyate
 lagnā talpa-bhujāṅga-puṅgava-tanau nirmoka-paṭṭāyate /
 nābhī-nīraruhasya sannidhi-carī yā rājahamsāyate
 sā paṇi-sthita-pāñcājanya-kirana śreṇī Hareḥ pātu vaḥ //4
 Vāta-vyādhi-yuto vayasy=ati-gurau tiṣṭhan=balī santataḥ
 saty-āsakta-matir=jjagat-traya-bitam kurvvan=dadhānaḥ kṣamām /
 aṁtaḥstham gamayan=dhanañjayam=anauddhaty-ānvitam dīpra-bham
 śreyaḥ-santataye Purāṇapurūṣo devaḥ sad=aiv=astu vaḥ //5
 Vakṣaḥsthal-occhalita-kaustubha-kānti-liptam
 paṇi-sthitam=bhavatu Cakradharasya cakram /
 yuddheṣv=aneka-danujendra-kāthora-kaṇṭha-
 cched-āvasakta-rudhir-augham=iva śrīye vaḥ //6
 Vilasita-vanamālo dīpta-Vairocana-śrī-
 viratikṛd=anurajyat-Pannagārīr=nikāmam /
 bhuvana-janaka-vidyut-puñja-pīt-ambaro vo
 ghaṭayatu ghana-kālāḥ Keśavo maṅgalāni //7
 Śliṣyat-sudarśana-payodhara kṛṣṇam=udyad-
 bhīm-āhava-prakaṭit-āndhaka-putra-nāśam /
 stutyam su-parvvabhir=alaṅkṛta dharmma-pakam
 Vyāsasya kāvyam=iva pātu Harer=vvapur=vvah //8
 Astr=īti viśva-vidito='pi babhūva yaḥ strī
 bhagn-ārjuno='py=akṛta yo bitam=Arjunasya /
 yaḥ Śeṣa-bhoga-vihita-sthitir=apy=aśeṣa-
 bhog-opabhoga-kṛd=avaty=akhilam sa Śauriḥ //9
 Vaktram nābhī-saroja-cāru-hasitam yā pāñcājany-ojvala-
 jyotsnam kaustubha-ratna-śoṇam=adharam keśan=vapur=mecakān /
 śastam śārṅga-dhanur=latā-kuṭilatam dhatte='nukarttum bhruvor=
 dvandvam Dānava-sūdanasya dayitā devī śrīye vo='stu sa //10
 Virocan-endīvaramitra-locanām
 saroja-hastam kanak-ojval-āśmukam /
 bibharti Lakṣmīm=iva yaḥ prabhuḥ=tanum
 sa Vāsudevo duritāni hantu vaḥ //11
 Udvarttana-pratinipā-a-vaśāt=payodhau
 dvedhā-vidīrṇa-salile jala-śāyinā yaḥ /
 svasy=aiva mūrttir=aparā hata-yoga-nidram=
 ālokito vijayate sa Murāri-mīnaḥ //12
 Yasya trasadbhir=avanīdhara-tāḍanebhyo
 yādo-gaṇair=udara-pāda-tale nilīnaih /
 pīyūṣa-manthana-vīpan=niratiryat=ābdhau
 Kūrm-ātmakaḥ sa Harir=astu vibhūṭaye vaḥ //13
 Sūry-ādhiṣṭhita-dakṣiṇ-ākṣi-kiraṇaiḥ samvartta-vāty-olvaṇaiḥ
 samśoṣam mukha-nārutaiś=ca sutarām=ek-ārṇṇave gacchati /
 Prthvīm pheṇa-kṛit-āspadām=iva dadhad=damṣṭr-āśmū-liptam
 Hariḥ kol-ātmā vitaratv=a-pūrṇa-salila-kīḍa-sprho vaḥ śivam //14
 Viṣṇor=ddhārayataḥ sadā-kavacita-skandham nṛsimh-ārdhhatam
 deyaśuḥ karapatra-yantra-niṣitaḥ śāśvat=sukham vo nakhāḥ/

yair=vakṣaḥ khaṇatā Hirāṇyakaśīpor=devena datta-śrīyām=
 utkṛtāḥ su-cir-otthito bṛdi mahān=duḥkha-drumo nākinām //15
 Yacñām cetasi matsarād=virahitasy=eva śrīyā bibhrataḥ
 pratyaṅgam laghutām ca Vāmana-Hareḥ pāda-dvayaṁ pātu vaḥ /
 hastānām vividh-āyudha-pramathit-āmartya-dviṣām=īrṣayā
 nūnām yena rasātalaṁ pragamito vikramya Vairocanaḥ //16
 Tri-bhuvana-guru-śiṣyaś=cāpa-vede maniṣī
 niśita-paraśu-lūn-āśeṣa-rājanya-vamśaḥ /
 jayati muni-sama-jyā-rajyad-ātmā Sahasrā-
 rjuna-bhuja-vana-khaṇḍ-āṅgāra-krij-Jāmadagnyaḥ //17
 Mayy=aśvasya tay=edam=arpitam=iti prabhv-ātmanā Janakī-
 cūḍa-ratnam=uṇḍhitam caranayor=mūle Marut-sūnūnā /
 gr̥hṇan=sa-praṇayaṁ sa-sāndra-karuṇām s-āvṛtti sa-pratyayaṁ
 s-otsāham sa-bahu-trapaṁ vijayate devo Daśasy-ānta-kṛt //18
 Śrāvair=dhātu-ras-aktam=udyad-upal-āsaṅg-āsṛg-āśāmkaya
 hā kiṁ jātam=iti pramṛjya paritāḥ sva-sv-ottariy-āñcalaiḥ /
 yaṁ rom āñcitam=a-kṣat-āṅgam=api ca vyālokya gopyo mudā
 valganti sma sa-helam=uddhṛta-giriḥ Kṛṣṇaḥ sa puṣṇātu vaḥ //19
 Veda-kriy-āmbu-rahitam karuṇā-trṇ-augha-
 cchann-ānanaṁ Sugata-darśana-nimna-kūpam /
 pātāya yaḥ kali-yug-aika-suhṛc=cakāra
 lokasya Buddha iti rakṣatu vaḥ sa Viṣṇuḥ //20
 Tarkṣ-ārohaṇa-niḥspṛhasya turageṇ=odhasya barhaṁ vina
 kālo yasya kare sthitaḥ kali-samucchedam kariṣyaty=asiḥ /
 go-samyukta-vṛṣaṁ vidhāsyati kṛtām sṛṣṭvā prakṛṣṭam yugam
 Mlecchānām=avasāna-kṛt=sa bhagavān=Kalkī Hariḥ pātu vaḥ //21
 Subh-ākhyānam ghor-āhava-ghaṭita-bhīmaṁ śakuninā
 pradhānen=opetaṁ vijayi-bhuja-niṣpīḍita-vṛṣam /
 kram-odgacchad-Gaṅgā-prthuka-mahanīyam Mura-ripoh
 sva-rūpaṁ sampattyai bhavatu bhavatām Bhāratam=iva //22
 Pātu vo daitya-patibhir=mahā-senair=a-pīḍitāḥ /
 Harir=Indra-Hara-Brahma-Mahāsenair=ap=īḍitāḥ //23
 Viṣṇuḥ pūrta-pāñcājanya-kuhara-prodbhūta-mandr-āravaṣ=
 talp-āhi-śvasit-ānilaiḥ pracalatām nābhī-saroje gate /
 trasten=Ābjabhuvā tr̥tīya-savanen=āmnāya-pāṭhe kṛte
 prāg-udbuddha-Payodhija-dhṛta-pado bhūtyai-prabodho='stu vaḥ //24
 Padmā-yuktoḥ sa-padmo='pi vṛṣaḥ=api vṛṣāya yaḥ /
 hat-ārir=ari-sampanno='py=astu vaḥ śreyase Hariḥ //25
 Sevitaḥ sura-gaṇaiḥ sa-suparṇaś=
 chāyay=ati-ghanayā ramanīyāḥ/
 sthāsnutām dadhad=alañkṛta-kāmāḥ
 kalpa-vṛkṣa iva pātu Harir=vaḥ //26
 A-bhāro='yaṁ nūnām yadi janita-khedo='si tad=amum
 tyaja tvad-viśrāntyai kṣaṇam=api vahāmo vayam=imam /
 Harir=jat-aścaryaiḥ kṛta-nutibhir=arttaiḥ pramuditair=
 hasann=ukto gopair=iti jayati citraṇ=giri-varam //27
 Anārataṁ yo danujendra-yoṣid-

vilocan-ārdrikaraṇāya nūnam /
 bibhartti dhār-ambu Hareḥ karastho
 lunātu duḥkhāni sa nandako vaḥ //28
 Na nava-jalada-śyāmaṁ yad=yan=na kaustubha-śobhitaṁ
 na Jaladhi-suta-sotkaṇṭhaṁ yan=na yad=Garuḍa-dhvajam /
 na yad=asi-gadā-śaṅkh-āmbhojair=niruddha-karaṁ Harer=
 jayati gaditaṁ tad=Vedāntaḥ probodhamayaṁ vapuḥ //29
 Daityān=nighnann=anu-Badarik-āraṇya-kuñjaṁ tapasyan
 Śrī-saṁśleṣ-otsavam=anubhavan=palayan=viṣṭapāni /
 tat=tat=kiñcit-samam=atiśay-occhṛṅkhalas=tena tena
 vyatanvāno jayati vapuṣā viśva-vandyo Mukundaḥ //30
 Bahur=vidhattaṁ bhavataṁ śriyaṁ sa
 Kāṁsa-dviṣeḥ Keśi-rada-vraṇ-āṅkaḥ /
 vīci-vicitrasya Dineśa-putrī-
 pūrasya dūraṁ jayati śriyaṁ yaḥ //31
 Niskrāmat-Kamalā-mukh-endu-nipatan-netrasya ḡatre Harer=
 udbhinnāḥ saha manmathena bhavataḥ pāntu śram-āmbhaḥ-kaṇāḥ /
 mantha-kṣoṇidhar-āhati-vyatikarād=utthāya pāthonidher=
 lagnānaṁ vimala-tvisāṁ dadhati ye mukta-mañirāṁ bhramam //32
 Kando v=āmara-pādapasya kumudād=ambhoja-bhājaṁ śriyaṁ
 nirmmatum pratibhūr=mṛigāṅka-mukurasy=āmbhoda-kāl-ānilaḥ /
 tarā-pārada-vipruṣāṁ hutavahaḥ kokī-rata-prakriyā-
 śākṣī dakṣiṇam=iḥṣaṇaṁ Mura-ripoi=devo Raviḥ pātu vaḥ //33
 Tasmāt=samāmbana-daṇḍa-yonir=
 abhūj=janasva skhalataḥ sva-mārggāt /
 vaṁśeḥ sad=aiv=oḍha-raso nṛpāṇām=
 anudgat-aino-ghuṇa-kīṭa-randhraḥ //34
 Samutthito='rkād=anaraṇya-yonir=
 utpanna-punnāga-kadamba-śākhāḥ /
 āścaryam=antaḥ-prasarat-kuśo='yaṁ
 vaṁśo='rthināṁ śrīpbalatāṁ prayati //35
 Ādhi-vyādhi-kuvṛtta-durggati-parityakta-prajās=tatra te
 sapta-dvīpa-bhujo nṛpāḥ samabhavann=Ikṣvāku-Rām-ādayaḥ /
 yeṣāṁ durjaya-dānavendra-jayināṁ tair=Indra-mukhyair=makhe-
 sv=āhūtair=upayācīteṣv=iva purodāsena tṛptaḥ suraiḥ //36
 Tasminn=ath=āri-vijayena virājamāno
 rāj=anurañjita-jano='jani Cāhamānaḥ /
 sampūrṇaś=candra iva candrikayā triyāmāṁ
 kīrtty=ojjvalatvam=anayad=bhuvana-trayīm yaḥ //(37*)

CHAPTER XIII

Abbreviations in Viśvarūpasena's Charter

The Vaṅgīya Sahitya Pariṣad (Calcutta) plate of the Sena king Viśvarūpasena (c. 1206-20 A.D.) of Eastern Bengal, which was originally found at the village of Madhyapāḍa near Dacca (Bangladesh), was edited by H.P. Shastri in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. II, 1926, pp. 77ff., and again by N.G. Majumdar in his *Inscriptions of Bengal* (Vol. III, 1929), pp. 140ff., 177ff. Scholars, however, failed to interpret the numerous abbreviations used in the document. The grant portion of the inscription in question runs from line 35 to line 68. Of these, lines 35-38 speak of king Viśvarūpasena as the son of king Lakṣmaṇasena and the grandson of king Ballālasena, while lines 38-41 mention a number of the king's subordinates, dependants, officers and others, to whom the royal order regarding the grant recorded in the charter was addressed. The details of the grant are quoted in the king's order that follows in lines 41-68. We shall take up this part, section by section, for the purpose of interpretation.

The language of the grant part of the record, written in Sanskrit, is influenced by the local dialect. We have the use of Prakritic words like *laggavayitva* (Bengali *lāgāiṇya*, 'having planted'), etc. The rules of Sanskrit grammar, especially those regarding *Sandhi*, have been often ignored; but the most interesting feature of the said part of the inscription is the use of a number of contractions, many of which, as we have already said, could not be satisfactorily explained; e.g. *saṁ*, *sāṁ*, *hi*, *ṭi*, *vyā*, *u*, etc. These will be explained in our interpretation of the grant portion of the Sāhiya Pariṣad plate in the following lines.

I. (a) *viditam=astu bhavatām yathā Paundravardhana-bhukty-antahpāti-Vaṅge Nāvyē Rāmasiddhi-pāṭake Varāhakunḍa-dakṣiṇa-pāścime pūrvve Devahāra-devabhoga-sīmā dakṣiṇe Vāṅgalavaḍa-bhūh sīmā pāścime nadī sīmā uttare tathā nadī sīmā evaṁ catuḥ-sīm-āvacchinna-vāstu-bhūmy-udāna 34 $\frac{1}{4}$.*

(b) (1) *tathā Devahāra-pūrvve ṭi 4 vyā-bhū-u 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ vāstu-u-prati-hi 1 $\frac{5}{8}$; tathā nāla-bhū-u 26 $\frac{3}{4}$; (2) Devahāra-uttare nāla-bhū-u 2 nāla-u-prati-hi 1 $\frac{1}{8}$; (3) *evaṁ sa vāstu bhū-udān 1 67 $\frac{3}{4}$ grāma-patyā sām-hi 80 $\frac{5}{16}$.**

(c) *tath=aitad-grāme vāra-Nako-Lokta-Gāṇik-ādīnām nūtana-baraja-catuṣ-ṭaya sameta vāra-Śremano-Udayi-Apara-Loktakānām baraja-traya-samvalita- (bhūḥ*)*

sām-hi 19¹¹/₁₆ militvā kā 2 kham 7 dvabhyām trayodaś-abdiya Uttarāyaṇa-mahā-samkramaṇa-sambandhena samutsarggita-bhū-sām-sām-hi 100.

Subsection (a) mentions the first plot of the gift land measuring 24³/₄ Udānas. In writing fractions in the record, each quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) is indicated by a vertical *danṭa*, while each quarter of a quarter ($\frac{1}{16}$) by a slanting *danṭa*. In the case occurring in the above sub-section, three quarters are indicated by three vertical *danṭas*. The exact area of an Udāna is unknown; but we equated it roughly with $\frac{1}{9}$ Bighā in a note in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXVI, 1950, pp. 309-13.¹ The subsection speaks of a plot of homestead (*vāstu*) land situated to the south-west of Varāha's *kuṇḍa* (i.e. the tank belonging to the temple of the god Varāha or the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu) in the village called Rāmasiddhi-pāṭaka. This village is stated to have been lying in the Nāvya (literally, 'Navigable') Division of Vaṅga forming a part of the Paundravarddbana *bhukti* (province). The plot of land referred to was bounded in the east by the *deva-bhoga* at Devahāra, i.e. land belonging to a god (possibly Varāha, mentioned above) worshipped in a locality called Devahāra apparently in the village of Rāmasiddhi-pāṭaka. Its southern boundary was a piece of land forming part of an area called Vaṅgalavaḍā, while in the west and north it was bounded by a river.

Subsection (b) speaks of three other plots of the gift land situated near the plot mentioned in Subsection (a) and also quotes the total area of the four plots of land together with its annual revenue income. Several contractions have been used in this subsection. Of these, *ṭi* in extract (1) seems to stand for *ṭikara* meaning 'a mound' (cf. Hindi *ṭikar*, *ṭikrā*; Bengali *ṭikar*, *ṭikarā*; Oriya *ṭikara*, etc; and also *ṭikarī* and *ṭikaribasti* in Wilson's *Glossary*). This abbreviation occurs many times in the Mehar plate, published in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 182-91.² *Vyā-bhū-u* stands apparently for *vyāmiśra-bhūmy-udāna* (better 'udānani) in which *vyāmiśra-bhūmi* no doubt means 'mixed land', i.e. land containing some of the *vāstu* (homestead) category and some of the *nāla* (arable, in which sense the word *nāl* is still used in Bengali) class, although some other types of land may also have been included in it (cf. *khila* or waste land mentioned in line 60 of the record).³ In the same extract, *nāla-bhū-u* similarly means *nāla bhūmy-udāna*. But more interesting is the passage *vāstu-u prati-hi* 1 $\frac{1}{2}$, in which *hi* certainly stands for *hiraṇya* in the sense of 'coin, money or cash'.

1. See also Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 416ff. (p. 418).

2. Cf. *gr-ṭi* or *grha-ṭi* (*grha-ṭikara*), *vā-ṭi* (*vāstu-ṭikara*); also *ca-ṭi*, *gr-ca-ṭi* and *ci-khi-mu-ṭi*. The editors of the Mehar plate explain *ṭi* as *vāṭi* or *caṭi*, *gr-ṭi* or *grha-ṭi* as *grha-vāṭi* and *mu-ṭi* as *mukhya-vāṭi*. The abbreviations of words like *vāṭi* and *caṭi* are expected to be *vā* and *ca* respectively and not *ṭi* for both of them. Moreover, no word like *caṭi* is recognised in the lexicons. Again, the contraction *mu-ṭi* cannot stand for *mukhya-vāṭi* meaning 'prominent or principal house-site or garden' not only because the word *mukhya* would in that case be quite meaningless but also because an analysis of the specified revenue income of the different plots of land as quoted in the Mehar copper-plate inscription shows that the rent of a Droṇa of *gr-ṭi* and *ca-ṭi* was verily considerably higher than that of a Droṇa of *mu-ṭi*. In *ci-khi-mu-ṭi*, *ci-khi* apparently stands for *cira-khila* referring to a plot of land that was never brought under cultivation or any other profitable use and therefore fetched no revenue income at all. See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p. 56. For *mu* = *munda*, *muṇḍā*, 'barren', see now the Nilachal plate (JAIH, Vol. II, pp. 65ff.).

3. The editors of the Mehar plate explain *vyā bhū* as '*catuḥ śim-avacchinna-vāstu-bhūmi*, i.e. *vyāvṛtta-vāstu-bhūmi*, it demarcated homestead land or residential site.' But, if *vyā* means merely 'demarcated', how can't go only with homestead land and never with arable land? Moreover, although *vyā-bhū* and *nā-bhū* (*nāla-bhūmi*, arable land), are separately mentioned there is definite evidence to show that the category of land called *vyā-bhū* in the Mehar plate included some land of other categories like *nā-bhū*. See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, pp. 55-56.

The passage thus stands for *vāstu-bhūmy-udāna-prati-hiranya* $1\frac{3}{8}$, which means to say that the annual revenue income of the plot of land was at the rate of $1\frac{3}{8}$ of the standard coin per Udāna of homestead land. Expressions like *udāna-prati*, 'per Udāna', are common in Bengali. In line 59 of the inscription, the standard coin is mentioned as *Cūrṇī* which is known to have been another name of the well-known *Purāṇa* as shown in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 45 and note 3. The meaning of the contraction *hi* is clearly suggested by the passage *etan-mūlyam hi* 40 in lines 50-51, which no doubt means: 'the price of this is in coins 40 only'. Similarly, in extract (2), *nāla-bhū-u* and *nāla-u-prati-hi* stand respectively for *nāla-bhūmy-udāna* and *nāla-bhūmy-udāna-prati-hiranya*. The rates of the annual revenue income per Udāna of homestead and arable land in the two cases here have been specially mentioned because they were lower than the usual rates. The expression *grāma-patyā* used in extract (3) seems to stand for *grāma-jana-patitvāt* possibly suggesting that the revenue income came from the tenants who were inhabitants of the village of Rāmasiddhi-pāṭaka in question (cf. *nānā-patyā* below). In this extract, the contraction *sām* has been used to indicate *sāmvatsarika* (i.e. annual). Thus *sām-hi* stands for *sāmvatsarika-hiranya*, i.e. annual revenue income in the standard coin called *Cūrṇī* or *Purāṇa*.⁴

Therefore the three plots of land mentioned in subsection (b) were: (1) four mounds of mixed land lying to the east of Devahāra and measuring $4\frac{1}{4}$ Udānas, of which the *vāstu* portion fetched annually revenue income at the rate of $1\frac{1}{8}$ Purāṇas per Udāna; (2) $26\frac{3}{4}$ Udānas of arable land lying in the same place; and (3) 2 Udānas of arable land lying to the north of Devahāra and fetching annually revenue income at the rate of $1\frac{1}{8}$ Purāṇas per Udāna. Extract (3) says that all the plots of land [at Rāmasiddhi-pāṭaka], a part of which was homestead land (*sa-vāstu*), together measured $67\frac{1}{4}$ Udānas, of which the annual revenue income was $80\frac{5}{16}$ Purāṇas. Elsewhere this grant is stated to have been made in the month of Pauṣa during the thirteenth regnal year of Viśvarūpasena.

In subsection (c) the word *vāra* (cf. also frequent use of the word below) is found before a group of personal names. The word means 'collection' in Sanskrit lexicons and, in the present case, it apparently means to say that a group of *barajas* or betel-vine plantations was held jointly by the persons mentioned. The word *sameta* and *samvalita* have been used in the sense of *samyukta* or *sambaddha* meaning 'attached to', with which the word *bhūmi* is to be understood. *Milivalita* is Sanskrit *milita* or *sammilita*. *Ka* stands for *kāṇḍa* or a cluster, and *kham* for *khaṇḍa* or a piece. The contraction *sām* stands for a word like *sambaddha*, *sambandhena*, etc., i.e. for *samkrānta* in its Bengali sense.

4. As regards the meaning of *sām-hi*, the editors of the Mehar copper-plate inscription observe, "N. G. Majumdar (*Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III, p. 146, f.n. 3) explains *sām* in the sense of *sāhalyena*, 'in all,' while on page 125, f.n. 2, he rightly suggests that *sām-hi* stands for *śāṣvatam*. In the Edilpur copper plate of Keśivasena, *sā* or *sām* stands for *śāṣvatan* = *day-otpa itika[m]*, *hi* being obviously *sahiḥ* (Madanpāḍā copper plate of Viśvarūpasena, line 44). It should, however, be noticed that the suggestion regarding *sām-hi* = *śāṣvatam* has been wrongly attributed to N. G. Majumdar who never said anything like that. Again, what was read in the Madanpāḍā plate as *sahiḥ*, which gives little sense, is undoubtedly *bahiḥ* (Bengali *bai*, 'excluding'). Moreover, the meaningless *sahiḥ* can hardly clarify the implication of *sām-hi* which cannot stand for *śāṣvatam* as the latter does not contain either *sām* or *hi*. Besides *sām-hi* = *sāmvatsarika-hiranya*, the Mehar plate also has *grā-hi* apparently standing for *grāhya-hiranya*, i.e. revenue to be realised in cash. See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p. 55.

Thus subsection (b) says that in the same village (i.e. Rāmasiddhi-ṛāṭaka) four new betel-vine plantations in the joint possession of Nāko, Lokta, Gañika and others and three other [old] betel-vine plantations in the joint possession of Śremāno, Udayi, Aparā and Loktaka (probably the same as Lokta mentioned above, or *Aparā-Loktaka* means 'a second Loktaka'), in all seven units in two lots, fetching an annual revenue income of $19\frac{11}{15}$ Purāṇas, were also granted. The income of these, viz. $19\frac{11}{16}$ Purāṇas, added to that of the land mentioned in subsection (a), viz. $80\frac{5}{16}$ Purāṇas, is stated to make up the annual revenue income of 100 Purāṇas attaching to the grant made on the occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-saṅkṛānti [in the month of Pauṣa] during the year 13 (ie the thirteenth regnal year of king Viśvarūpasena).

II. *tathā Nāvye Vinayatilaka grāme pūrvve samudra-sīmā dakṣiṇe Panullibhūh simā paścime jaṅghāla-sīmā uttare śāsana-sīmā evaṁ catuḥ-sīm-āvacchinna-savāstu-bhū-udāna 25 nānā-patyā sām-hi 60.*

This section speaks of another plot of land including some homestead land and measuring 25 Udānas. The annual revenue income accruing to it was 60 Purāṇas. The expression *nānā-patyā* used in this connection possibly means *grāma-jana-patitvāt* suggesting that the tenants holding the plot of land in question were inhabitants of different villages of the neighbourhood. The plot was situated at Vinayatilaka-grāma in the Nāvya Division of Vaṅga referred to above and was bounded in the east by the sea (possibly indicating one of the wide mouths of a river falling in the Bay of Bengal), in the south by a piece of land belonging to Pranullī (either a locality or a person), in the west by a *jaṅghāla* (an embankment) and in the north by a *śāsana*. The word *śāsana* here means a piece of land enjoyed rent-free by virtue of a *śāsana* or royal charter (cf. line 57 of the inscription). If Rāmasiddhi-ṛāṭaka and Vinayatilaka-grāma (both in the Nāvya Division) were neighbouring villages, *śāsana* in this case may refer to a plot of land, of which the grant is recorded in section I of the present charter.

III. *tathā Madhukṣīrak-āvṛttau Navasaṁgraha caturake Ajikulā-pāṭake yathā-prasiddha-sva-sim-āvacchinna⁵ Śauvasā-Kirito-Maito-Ucchok-ādīnām anen=aiv=Aavallika-paṁ- Halāyudhena kṛita-paṭṭolī-saṁ savāstu-bhūmy-udāna 165 nānā-patyā ucchannatvāt sām-hi 100 ; tath=aitad.vāstu-bhūmau kalana saṁ-sām guvāka-śata 30 etan-mūlyam hi 40; dvā sām hi 140.*

Of the abbreviations used in this section, *paṁ* stands for *paṁṭita* and *dvā* for *dvābhyām* (i.e. of, by or from the 'two' referred to above). Line 64 of the inscription shows that the *Āvallika Paṇḍita* Halāyudha was the donee of the present charter. The meaning of the expression *Āvallika* is uncertain; but Halāyudha may have been the resident of a locality called *Avalla* or *Āvalla*. This section speaks of a big piece of land measuring 165 Udānas; but its annual revenue income was only 100 Purāṇas. This unusually low amount of revenue seems to be explained by the expression *ucchannatvāt* possibly suggesting that many of the tenants, who were residents of different villages of the neighbourhood (cf. *nānā-patyā* explained above) were dead. It is stated that this plot of land was attached to (*saṁ=sambaddha*) the *paṭṭolī* (here meaning 'land purchased by a *paṭṭolī* or deed of purchase') that had been bought by Halāyudha (the donee of the present charter) from Śauvasā.

5. Correctly we should have *āvacchinnāni . . . , bhūmy-udānāni*.

Kirito, Maito, Uchoka and others. The absence of the word *vāra* in this connection suggests that these persons held different portions of the land severally. This piece of land, the boundaries of which were fixed and well known, was situated in a village called Ajikulā-pāṭaka in the Navasaṃgraha *caturaka* (a small administrative unit) within the Madhuksīraka *avṛtti* (a slightly bigger administrative unit). The fact that the land was purchased by the donee shows that the king (the donor of the present charter) merely made it revenue-free. It should be noticed that, while *śāsana* means a rent-free holding, the holder of a *paṭṭoli* had to pay rent for his holding.

Along with the above plot of land was also granted a *kalana* (cf. line 59 of the inscription), apparently meaning a betelnut plantation, situated on the *vāstu* portion of it. The produce (cf. *sam*=*sambaddha*) of this plantation was 30 hundred (i.e. three thousand) betelnuts per annum, the price of which constituted an annual income of 40 Purāṇas (or the plantation had 3000 arecanut palms expected to yield 40 Purāṇas annually). It has to be noticed that the rent-paying holders of the land, from whom Halāyudha purchased it, did not own the betelnut plantation, the possession of which was a monopoly of the kings, *jāgirdārs* and privileged tenants (cf. line 60 of the inscription). When the king made the plot rent-free in favour of Halāyudha, the right of ownership of the plantation had to be automatically made over to the donee.

The annual income of the plot of land, viz. 100 Purāṇas, added to the income from the price of betelnuts annually produced by the plantation on it, viz. 40 Purāṇas, made up the income of 140 Purāṇas per year.

IV. *tathā Vikramapura-bhāge Lāuhaṇḍā-caturake Deulahastyām nadi-pūrvva-pāścime rāja-hita⁶ sa eva vāra-Āranto-Kāmya-Piṇṭhanāg-ādinām anen=aiva kṛta-paṭṭoli-sam-savāstu-bhūmy-udāna 25 sam-hi 50.*

This section speaks of another piece of land situated to the east and west of a river in the village of Deulahastī within the Lāuhaṇḍā *caturaka* forming a part of the Vikramapura *bhāga* (Division). The expression *rāja-hita* (literally, 'the income of which is enjoyed by the king'), used in relation to the land, suggests that the plot formed a part of the king's Khas Mahal, although it was held jointly by the tenants Āranto, Kāmya, Piṇṭhanāga and others, from whom Halāyudha secured it as a *paṭṭoli* by purchase. A portion of the plot was of the homestead category. It was 25 Udānas in area and fetched an annual income of 50 Purāṇas.

V. *tribhiḥ mātṛ-carāṇānām dṛṣṭe naḥ soma-grāse samutsarggita-bhū sam-bandhena guvāka mūlya sameta-sam-hi 250.*

This section sums up the total income of the three gifts mentioned in sections II-IV and says that the annual income of the land granted, including the price of the annual yield of arecanuts, comes up to 250 Purāṇas per annum. We have seen that the annual income of the grants made in the villages of Vinayatilaka-grāma, Ajikulā-pāṭaka and Deulahastī was respectively 60, 140 and 50 Purāṇas, i.e. in all 250 Purāṇas. It is stated that these three gifts were made on the occasion of the observation of a lunar eclipse by the king's mother.

6. Apparently the author had in his mind *rāja-hita sā eva . . . bhūmih*; but the expression he uses below is *bhūmy-udāna*. Correctly, therefore, we should have *rāja-hitani tāni eva . . . bhūmy-udānāni*.

VI. *tath=aitad-grāme vāra-Brahmo-Amṛtokayoḥ anen=aiva kṛta-paṭṭoli-saṁ varṣa-vṛddhau kumāra-Sūryyasena-pradatta-nāla-bhū-u 7 ; guvāka-vāstu-bhū-u 3 ; dvā sa-vā-bhū u 10 sām-hi 25.*

Mention is made here of one other plot of land situated at the same village (i.e. Deulabastī). It was attached to the *paṭṭolī* purchased by Halāyudha from the joint holders named Brahmo and Amṛtoka. One part of it consisted of seven Udānas of arable land and the other of three Udānas of homestead land containing a betelnut plantation. These two parts made up in all ten Udānas of land containing some of the *vāstu* category (*dvā sa-va bhū-u=dvābhyām sa-vāstu-bhūmy-udānāni*) and fetched an annual income of 25 Purāṇas. This grant was made by Prince Sūryasena (very probably a son of Viśvapūpasena) on the occasion of his birthday anniversary and the king merely ratified the creation of a rent-free holding. The land owned by the donee by purchase now became rent-free and the donee acquired the additional right to enjoy the betelnut plantation on it. This plot of land apparently formed part of a *jāgīr* under Prince Sūryasena. It seems that the holder of a *jāgīr* could grant a piece of land out of it, although the action required the king's approval. Very probably he had to pay an amount of money as fees to the State for the creation of the rent-free holding as otherwise he would get no religious merit and the State also would not allow him to do it.

VII. *tath=aitad-grāme vāra-Kano-Amṛtokayoḥ anen=aiva kṛta-paṭṭoli-saṁ sādhipigrahika-Nāṇisimha-pradatta-nāla-bhū-u-3 ; guvāka-vāstu-bhū-u 4 ; dvā sa-vāstu-bhū-u 7 ; sām hi 50.*

In the same village of Deulabastī was granted another piece of land consisting of a *nāla* and a *vāstu* section. The arable part measured three Udānas and the homestead part, which contained a betelnut plantation on it, was four Udānas in area. The two sections of the plot, containing some land of the homestead category, together measured seven Udānas, of which the annual income was 50 Purāṇas.

The land was originally under the joint possession of Kano and Amṛtoka (the same person as mentioned in section VI), from whom Halāyudha purchased it as a *paṭṭolī*. It apparently formed part of a *jāgīr* in the possession of Nāṇisimha who was the *Sādhipigrahika* (minister for war and peace probably of king Viśvarūpasena). The king no doubt ratified the minister's gift of the land as a rent-free holding. The minister appears to have paid the necessary fees to the State for the creation of the rent-free holding.

VIII. *tathā=Phandradvīpe Urā-caturake Jayajāhādā-pūrvve Ghāgharakāṭṭī-pāṭake rāja-paṁ Maheśvarasya anen=aiv=Āvallika paṁ Halāyudhena kṛta-śāsana-saṁ-sa-vāstu-bhū-udāna 12½ ; sām-hi 50.*

This section refers to a plot of land situated in the village called Ghāgharakāṭṭī-pāṭaka lying to the east of Jayajāhādā in the Urā *caturaka* of Phandradvīpa. It was attached to the *śāsana* (i.e. land granted rent-free by a charter) which was purchased by Halāyudha from the *Rāja-paṁ* (i.e. *Rāja-paṇḍita*) Maheśvara. The area of the land was 12½ Udānas and its annual revenue income 50 Purāṇas. In this case, the king merely allowed Halāyudha the rent-free enjoyment of the land by recognizing its alienation by Maheśvara. It appears that a revenue-free holding lost its special character on alienation and that its new owner had to pay the annual rent fixed for it unless the king again made it revenue-free.

IX. *tathā Phandradvīpe Patilādivike kumara-śrī-Puruṣottamasena-bhujyamān-āya-sam anen=aiva caturddas-ābdīya-utthānadvādaśyām samutsarggita-bhū-sambandhena datta-sa-vāstu-bhūmy-udāna 24 ; sām-hi 50.*

This section speaks of a piece of land situated in the village of Pātīlādivika in Phandradvīpa. It was attached to the *āya* meaning 'income' or 'property' and referring apparently to a *jāgīr* enjoyed by Prince Puruṣottamasena (possibly another son of Viśvarūpasena) and was granted by the Prince in favour of Halāyudha on the occasion of the Utthāna-dvādaśī (in the month of Kārttika) during the year 14 (i.e. in the fourteenth regnal year of king Viśvarūpasena). The king merely ratified the grant of the plot of land as a revenue-free holding apparently on the payment of the required fees by the purchaser. A portion of this plot was of the *vāstu* category. It measured 24 Udānas and its annual revenue income was 50 Purāṇas.

X. (a) *militvā s-ārddha-ṣaṭtrimśad-unmān-ādihika-śata-tray-odān-ātmakakalana guvāka-mūlya-varaj-āya-semeta-sām-cūrṇi-paiṇcaśatika- bhūmiḥ*

(b) *sa-jala-sthalā sa-jhāta-viṭapā sa-garṭt-oṣarā sa-khila-nālā sa-guvākanarikelā a-caṭṭa-bhaṭṭa-praveśa ā-candr-ārka-kṣiti-samakālaṁ yāvat*

(c) *devakula-puṣkarīny-ādikam karayitvā guvāka-narikel-ādikam laggāva-yitvā putra-pautr-ādi-santati-krameṇa svacchand-opabhogen=opa-bhoktum.....*

The sentence is incomplete (see below). Subsection (a) says that altogether the area of the various plots of land enumerated above came up to 300 Udānas and 36½ Unmānas. As the total of the number of Udānas enumerated separately in Sections I-IX actually comes up to 336½ Udānas, the word *Unmāna* mentioned here has to be taken as a synonym of *Udāna*. Subsection (b) says that the plots were granted together with the land and water, bushes and branches, pits and barren tracts and waste and arable land and without the right of entrance for the *caṭṭa-bhaṭṭas* (*cāṭas* and *bhaṭas* of the earlier records, possibly meaning head-constables and constables respectively). It is also said that the grant was meant to last as long as the sun, the moon and the earth would endure. Subsection (c) says that the donee and his descendants, such as sons, grandsons and others, were allowed to enjoy the lands at their pleasure by causing on them the erection of temples, excavation of tanks, plantation of betelnut, coconut and other trees, and similar works which were ordinarily not allowed to rent-paying tenants.

XI. *Vātsya-sagotrasya Aurva-Cyavana-Bhārgava-Jāmadagny-Āpnuvat-paiṇca-pravarasya Yajurved-antaragata Kāṇva-śākh aīka-deś adhyāyino Lakṣmīdhara-deva-śarmmaṇaḥ prapautrāya tathā Devadharadevaśarmmaṇaḥ pautrāya tathā Adhyaya-devaśarmmaṇaḥ putrāya Vātsya-sagotrāya Aurva-Cyavana-Bhārgava-Jāmadagny-Āpnuvat-paiṇca-pravarāya Yajurved-āntargata-Kāṇva-śākh aīka-deś-ādhyāyine Āvalika-paṇ-śrī-Halāyudhadevaśarmmaṇe Brāhmaṇāya.....*

The sentence is still incomplete (see below). This section mentions the donee of the charter under study. He was *Paṇḍita* Halāyudhadevaśarmaṇ (probably a resident of Avalla or Āvalla), who belonged to the Vātsya gotra and the five *Pravaras*, viz. Aurva, Cyavana, Bhārgava, Jāmadagnya and Āpnuvat, and was a student of a part of the Kāṇva branch of the Yajurveda. The donee was the son of Adhyaya-devaśarmmaṇ, grandson of Devadharadevaśarmmaṇ and great-grandson of Lakṣmīdhara-devaśarmmaṇ.

- XII. (a) *Nāvyē mahā-uttarāyaṇa-mahāsaṁkramaṇe svayaṁ-datta-saṁ-sāṁ-bhū-hi* 100 ;
- (b) *Nāvya-Madhuksīraka Vaṅga-bhāgeṣu mātr-carāṇānāṁ dṛṣṭe naḥ soma-grāse datta-saṁ-sāṁ-bhū-hi* 250 ;
- (c) *Vikramapura bhāge varṣa-vṛddhau Kumāra-śrī-Sūryyasena-pra-datta-saṁ-sāṁ bhū-hi* 25 ;
- (d) *tathā hi sādhi-Nāṁśimha-datta-saṁ-sāṁ-bhū-hi* 25 ;
- (e) *Phandradvīpe Urā caturake kṛta-śāsana-saṁ-sāṁ-bhū-hi* 50 ;
- (f) *tathā Patilādivīke kumāra-Puruṣottamena datta-saṁ-sāṁ-bhū-hi* 50 |
- (g) *Militvā śrīmat-Sadāśiva-mudrayā mudrayitvā bhūcchidra nyāyena tāmraśāsanaṁ kṛtya pradatto=’smābhīḥ yatra baraja-guvāk-āya-sameta-tāmra-śāsana-sāṁ-bhū hi* 500.
- (h) *Tad=bhavadbhīḥ sarvair=eva anumantavyam.*

The sentence is concluded in this section. Subsections (a)-(f) refer again to the gift lands in different areas and mention the amounts of annual revenue allotted to them : (1) 100 Purāṇas per annum attaching to the gift land in Nāvya granted by the king himself on the occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-saṁkrānti in his thirteenth regnal year (see Section I) ; (2) 250 Purāṇas per annum attaching to the gift land in the Nāvya-Madhuksīraka-Vaṅga area granted on the occasion of the observation of a lunar eclipse by the king’s mother (see Section II-V) ; (3) 25 Purāṇas per annum attaching to the gift land in the Vikramapura Division granted by Prince Sūryasena on the occasion of his birthday anniversary (see Section VI) ; (4) 25 Purāṇas per annum attaching to the gift land in the same area granted by the Sādhi (i.e. Sādhi-vigrahika) Nāṁśimha (see Section VII) ; (5) 50 Purāṇas per annum attaching to the gift land in the Urā caturaka in Phandradvīpa, which had been purchased by the donee as a śāsana or rent-free holding (see Section VIII) ; and (6) 50 Purāṇas per annum attaching to the gift land at Patilādivīka granted by Prince Puruṣottama (see Section IX). Subsection (g) says that the plots of land were collectively granted as one lot by making it a tāmra-śāsana (i.e. as a rent-free holding) according to the principle of bhūcchidra (i.e. rent-free enjoyment of a piece of land by one who brings it under cultivation for the first time) and by endowing it with a stamp of the Sadāśiva seal (i.e. the royal seal of the Senas kings). It is also stated that the income arising out of the tāmra-śāsana, together with the income of the betelvine plantations and betelnuts, came up to 500 Purāṇas per annum. Subsection (h) requests the officials, etc., whom the king addressed (cf. lines 39-41 of the inscription), to approve of the grant made by him.

CHAPTER XIV

The Māgarājapaddhati and Vaidyahṛdayānanda

I

There is a single manuscript of a work entitled *Māgarājapaddhati* by Māgarāja in the Government Manuscripts Library deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. The manuscript, written on paper, is fragmentary and has an old look. It is a book on 'the medical science, dealing with medicines including charms. It has been noticed by Har Dutt Sharma in his *Descriptive Catalogue of the Vaidyaka Manuscripts* in the said collection.¹ To Sharma, the book appears to be 'extremely old', although we do not know what date is actually suggested by this description. There is, however, little doubt that the manuscript belongs to the late medieval period.

In the very short preface of the volume in question, Sharma makes particular mention of the author of the *Māgarājapaddhati* in the following words: "I would invite the attention of historians to these Mss., specially to [the] *Māgarājapaddhati* which is written by one Māgarāja of [the] Sahigila family ruling at Sādharaṇapura. My efforts to solve the identity of this ruler or his family or even Sādharaṇapura have been of no avail as yet."²

The language of the genealogy of the author, quoted from the work by Sharma, is full of errors;³ but there is no doubt about the meaning of the section. Verse 8 speaks of a hero named Sahagala who belonged to a family pertaining to the Kauśalya gotra, while verse 9 mentions his son Sāhana, though the word *sūnu* has been given as *sūna* in the text. The language of the description of the members of the family shows that they were ruling chiefs. It is, however, difficult to say whether Sahagala was really the progenitor of the family or the eponym of the Sahigila family.

Verses 10-11 describe Sāhana's son Dharma whose son Maṅgaṭa is mentioned in verse 12. The genealogy is then carried further as follows:—Maṅgaṭa's son Abhaṭa; his son Sambhava; his son Manora or Manorā; his son Kajjala; his son Vacharāja; his son Mahārāja; his son Gāgu; his son Nāthūdeva; his three sons Tripuradāya, Rūpācandra and Māgaḍeva. It was this Māgaḍeva who was the author of the *Māgarājapaddhati*. Māgaḍeva is also called Māmgadeva, Māgarāja, Maṅga, etc., and is represented as *Kaliṅg-ādi-viṣaya-vijayī*. At the end of Chapter I styled *Sva-vamśa-varṇana*, the same person is called Māgaḍacandradeva and is described as the son of

1. See Vol. XVI, Part I, Poona, 1939, pp. xiii, 170-76 (No. 142).

2. *Op. cit.*, p. xiii.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 170ff.

Nātharāja (i.e. Nāthū mentioned above) of the Sahigila family and as the author of the *Māgarājapaddhati*. Reference is also made to the sons of Māgadeva and his elder brothers as follows :—Tripuradāsa's two sons—Kundā and Nicandā; Rūpacandra's three sons—Kālidasa, Haridāsa and Jevidāsa (Devīdāsa); and Māgadeva's two sons—Durgādāsa and Bhojarāja.

It appears to us that Sahagala or Sahigila, the name of the family to which the author of the *Māgarājapaddhati* belonged, is no other than the Punjabi family name Saigal. It is not impossible that the family name Saigal is derived from the Arabic word *sīqal* = Hindi *saikal* meaning 'polishing metals, cleaning arms and tools', used in the sense of *Saiqalgār*, *Saikalgār*, *Saikalkār*, etc., indicating 'an armourer, a cleaner or polisher of arms or tools of metal'. It further appears to us that the locality called Sadharaṇapura is no other than the present Saharanpur, headquarters of a District of same name in U.P. It is bounded on the north by the Siwalik hills separating it from the Dehra Dun District; on the east by the Ganges; on the south by the Muzaffarnagar District; and on the west by the Jamuna. It is interesting to note that the Saiqalgars or armourers appear as a minor caste in the population of the Saharanpur region.⁵

The town of Saharanpur, headquarters of the District, was founded in the reign of Muḥammad bin Tughlaq Shāh about 1340 A.D. and is said to have derived its name from Shāh Harun Chishti whose shrine is still an attraction of the place.⁶

The stormy history of Saharanpur as discussed in the Gazetteer of the Saharanpur District does not throw any light on the author of the *Māgarājapaddhati*. Local investigation may be helpful in this matter. Māgarāja, who seems to have been a ruling chief of the area, does not appear to have flourished earlier than the fifteenth or sixteenth century A.D.

II

A work on medicine entitled *Vaidyahrdayānanda* was published in the *Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library*,⁷ Madras. The author of the work was one Yogī Praharāja, son of Nīlakanṭha of the Vatsa gotra, who was the preceptor of the chief queen of king Vikrama of Nandapura. Yogī Praharāja was also the author of another work on medicine, called *Vaidyalaṅkāra*.

In the *Journal of Oriental Research*,⁸ Madras, P.K. Gode published a note entitled 'Date of Vaidyahrdayānanda, a Work on Medicine by Yogī Praharāja—later than Circa A.D. 1550'. Gode first draws our attention to the occurrence of the expression *nāsā-bhūṣa-maṇi* in the *Vaidyahrdayānanda* and says, "I believe that the *nāsā-bhūṣa-maṇi* or nose-stud mentioned here is a typical ornament of South Indian ladies as contrasted with the elaborate *nath* of Maharashtra ladies. Evidently Yogī Praharāja hailed from South India where the nose-studs have been current for some centuries since the introduction of the nose-ornament in Indian life and culture about A.D. 1000." But it cannot be said that the ornament in question is the nose-stud and not the nose-pendant. Moreover, besides the *nath* or *besar* widely used in various parts of North India, both the nose-stud (called *nāk-kaḍāi*, *nāk-chābi* and *nāk-phul* in Bengali) and the nose-pendant (called *nolak* in Bengali) are even now popular in the rural

⁴. See Wilson, *Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms*, s.v.

⁵. H. R. Neville, *Saharanpur (District Gazetteers of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh)*, p. 111.

⁶. Hunter, *Imperial Gazetteer*, Vol. VIII, p. 100; H.R. Neville, *Saharanpur*, p. 181; cf. p. 320.

⁷. Vol. IV, No. 1, 1951, pp. 1-16.

⁸. Vol. XLIX, Part II, December, 1949 (published in 1952), pp. 166-71.

areas of Bengal. Their popularity among all classes of the women of Eastern India in the late medieval period cannot be doubted.

Gode then points out that the work uses the expression *anaṅgarāṅga-pravīṇa* which he takes to indicate one proficient in love as prescribed in the *Anaṅgarāṅga*. As the *Anaṅgarāṅga* is assigned by some writers to the closing decades of the fifteenth century, Gode is inclined to fix c. 1550 A.D. as the earlier limit to the date of the *Vaidyāhṛdayānanda*. It is, however, doubtful whether Kalyāṇamalla's *Anaṅgarāṅga* should be definitely ascribed to the close of the fifteenth century as some scholars are inclined to assign it to the sixteenth century,⁹ although Gode is possibly right in ignoring the *Kavicaritra* tradition ascribing the *Anaṅgarāṅga* to c. 1172 A.D. Even more doubtful is whether the *Anaṅgarāṅga* has been really mentioned in the expression *anaṅgarāṅga-pravīṇa* (literally, one proficient in amorous play) used in the *Vaidyāhṛdayānanda*. In spite of the indefinite nature of the argument on which Gode's conclusion regarding the date of the *Vaidyāhṛdayānanda* is based, his suggestion that the work was composed after the middle of the sixteenth century can fortunately be proved to be substantially correct. Gode rightly points out that Yogī Praharāja's date may be finally settled on the basis of the identification of his father's contemporary, king Vikarma of Nandapura. It is a matter of satisfaction that this ruler can be identified without much difficulty.

That Yogī Praharāja was an Oriya is suggested not only by the fact that the manuscripts of the *Vaidyāhṛdayānanda* were all found in the neighbourhood of Aska in the Ganjam District of Orissa, but also by his very cognomen. *Praharāja* is a typical Oriya family name not found in other parts of India. It is believed to have originally been a title conferred by the kings of Orissa on learned Brahmanas. Oriya scholars are inclined to take the family name *Praharāja* to be Sanskrit *Prahararāja* as another Oriya family name *Maṅgarāja* is believed to be the same as Sanskrit *Maṅgalarāja*. In that case, *Praharāja* may have originally been the title of astronomers at the royal courts, who calculated auspicious or inauspicious character of the divisions of a day, and this seems to be supported by the epithet *Praharāja-jyauṭiṣa-ravi* (i.e. the sun among the Praharāja astronomers) applied to the father of Yogī Praharāja in the *Vaidyāhṛdayānanda*. The family name Praharāja is found in the celebrated Oriya chronicle entitled *Mādala Pāñji*¹⁰ in the name *Mahāpātra* Balabhadra Praharāja. But this work, which is apparently a late medieval compilation, does not prove the antiquity of the cognomen. It may, however, be pointed out that it occurs in epigraphic records of the later monarchs of the Imperial Gaṅga family. Cf. *Kaliṅgaparīkṣā-Mahāpātra* Gaṅgādhara-dāsa Praharāja in the Srikurmam inscription of the 33rd Aṅka year of Narasiṃha (probably Narasiṃha II, c. 1278-1305 A.D.) and *Mahāpātra* Naraharidāsa Praharāja in the Puri Plates (A) of Narasiṃha IV (c. 1378-1410 A.D.).¹¹

The passage:

Yat-tātaḥ Praharāja-jyauṭiṣa-raviḥ śrī-Nīlakaṇṭhaḥ sudhīḥ
śrīman-Nandapureśa-Vikrama-nṛpa-śrī-paṭṭarājñī-guruh

occurring in a verse at the close of the *Vaidyāhṛdayānanda* speaks of king Vikrama of Nandapura, whose *Paṭṭarājñī* or chief queen was the disciple of Nīlakaṇṭha, father of the author of the work in question. There is little doubt that this Nandapura is

9. Vide Keir, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 470.

10. Ed. A.B. Mahanti, p. 28.

11. See *SII*, Vol. VI, No. 1244; *JASB*, Vol. LXIV, Part I, 1895, p. 149,

the deserted town of that name in the Koraput District of Orissa, which was the early capital of the Rājās of the old Jeypore (Jayapura) Zamindari. In 1939 Kumar Bidyadhar Singh Deo published a book entitled *Nandapur—A Forsaken Kingdom*, Part I, in which an attempt was made to offer a connected account of the Nandapura-Jayapura rulers. In spite of the rather unsatisfactory nature of the work, it helps us in determining the identity of king Vikrama who was a contemporary of Yogī Praharāja's father.

From a study of Kumar Bidyadhar Singh Deo's work referred to above, we see that there were no less than three kings named Vikrama among the rulers of the Nandapura-Jayapura Zamindari. According to the author, Vikrama I (called Vīra-Vikrama)¹² ruled in 1637-69 A.D., Vikrama II in 1758-81 A.D., and Vikrama III in 1825-60 A.D. There is, however, reason to believe that it was Vikrama I who was the contemporary of Nīlakanṭha, father of the author of the *Vaidyāhrdayānanda*. This is suggested by several facts. In the first place, it was he who in the later years of his rule transferred the capital of this ruling family from Nandapura to Jayapura,¹³ although for sometime even after that event the Zamindari may have been spoken of after the name of the old capital. Secondly, Vikrama II and III did not only not rule from Nandapura, they were insignificant Zamindars. Vikrama II (wrongly called Vikrama I by Kumar Baidyadhar Singh Deo) was usually mentioned as "the Rājā of Jayapura". Singh Deo quotes Aitchison's *Treaties*, etc.,¹⁴ to show that, in 1758 A.D., the name of Vikrama as Rājā of Jeypore was finally entered into the Jamma Kammil of the French.¹⁵ Thirdly, the importance of Vikrama I among the rulers of Nandapura is indicated by the fact that he received a copper-plate grant from the Sultān of Golconda.

There is little difficulty in determining the period when Vikrama I flourished on the throne of Nandapura. Kumar Bidyadhar Singh Deo says, "According to the family papers of Jeypore, Dasamatta ruled till 1637 A.D. when he was succeeded by Vīra Vikrama (i.e. Vikrama I). But according to our calculation, he (i.e. Dasamatta) must have ruled till 1622 A.D. when Krishna Raj came into power with the help of the Qutb Shahis of Golconda.....Ferishta places the occurrence of the death of Dasamatta and the succession of Krishna Raj thereafter in the period between 1610 A.D. and 1612 A.D."¹⁶ Even if the exact dates of the beginning and end of the rule of Vikrama I as indicated by the family papers are doubted, there can be no question regarding the period when he flourished. That Vikrama I ruled in the third quarter of the seventeenth century is established by the charter granted in his favour by the Qutab Shāhī Sultān of Golconda, which bears the date 1664 A.D.

If then Vikrama I of Nandapura ruled about the third quarter of the seventeenth century or exactly in the period 1637-69 A.D. as given by Kumar Bidyadhar Singh Deo, Nīlakanṭha Praharāja, preceptor of his chief queen, may be assigned roughly to the middle of the seventeenth century. Nīlakanṭha's son Yogī Praharāja, author of the *Vaidyāhrdayānanda*, therefore flourished in the second half of the same century. Thus the *Vaidyāhrdayānanda* seems to have been composed in the latter half of the seventeenth century.¹⁷

12. The author does not notice that, in Orissa, the epithet *vīra* was often prefixed to royal names. Cf. the numerous Vīra-Narasimhas and Vīra-Bhānus of the Imperial Gaṅga dynasty.

13. Singh Deo, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

14. Vol. VIII, 1892, p. 278.

15. *Op. cit.*, p. 94.

16. *Op. cit.*, pp. 65-66.

17. For some details, see *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 45ff.

CHAPTER XV

Jivadeva's Bhaktibhāgavata

I

A very important fact regarding the worship of the god Puruṣottama-Jagan-nātha in the Puri temple in Orissa is that the institution is South Indian in character. This is mainly because the later Eastern Gaṅgas—who built the temple and one of whom created the fiction of the god being the ruler of the country and the king merely his viceory—as well as their Sūryavaṁśī successors both hailed from the South.¹ The *Rathayātrā* ceremony of the god and the *Mādala Pāñji* or the Oriya chronicle of the temple clearly associate the Orissan religious establishment with similar institutions of South India.

The *Mādala Pāñji* is of exactly the same nature as South Indian temple chronicles like the *Maduraittalavaralāru* and *Śrīraṅgaṅkoyilolugu*, about which K.A. Nilakanta Sastri rightly observes, "While furnishing valuable hints on comparatively recent times, say from 1200 A.D. onwards, they are nothing more than a farrago of legends from the earlier times and contain too many inaccuracies and distortions to be used by themselves without the testimony of other more trustworthy sources."² It is therefore a pity that the *Mādala Pāñji* should have been given so much importance as a source of early Orissan history.

The compiler of the *Mādala Pāñji*, like those of the temple chronicles of South India, must have depended on traditions current among the temple priests regarding three royal families that had ruled over the Puri region respectively in the near, distant and remote past, viz. (1) Sūryavaṁśīs (i.e. the Sūryavaṁśī Gajapatis, c. 1435-1540 A.D.); (2) the Gaṅgas, (c. 1110-1435 A.D.); and (3) the Kesarīs (i.e. the Later Somavaṁśīs c. 1025-1110 A.D.). Consequently, the tradition about these three dynasties is partially, reliable in the first case, mostly unreliable in the second and the most worthless in the third.³

The tradition regarding the rule of the Kesarī dynasty over the Puri region was apparently based on the vague memory of some of the Later Somavaṁśī kings whose names ended with the word *kesarin*. So far as we know now, these are Uddyotakesarin (c. 1055-80 A.D.) and his grandson Karṇakesarin (c. 1100-10 A.D.). The

1. Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 238ff.; Vol. XXX, p. 19; Vol. XXXIII, p. 7; etc.
2. *A History of South India*, 1958, p. 21.
3. See below for details.
4. Cf. commentary on II, 5 (Vareṇḍra Research Society's edition, p. 42).

second of these rulers is called Karṇakesarin in Sandhyākaranandin's *Rāmacarita*⁴ dealing mainly with the career of the Pāla king Rāmapāla (c. 1082-1125 A.D.) of Bengal and Bihar. The Ratnagiri copper-plate grant⁵ of the same Somavamśī king, however, quotes the name as Karṇarājadeva. This may be due to the fact that Karṇa is the *nām-aika-deśa* like Rāma for Rāmacandra, Kumbha for Kumbhakarṇa, etc.⁶ It is of course difficult to say whether the Later Somavamśīs were known even to their coteremporaries as Kesarīs. But the names of Later Somavamśī kings like Uddyotakesarin and Karṇakesarin have obviously a bearing on the tradition of Kesarī rule over the Puri region before the Gaṅga conquest of the areas, as recorded in the *Mādala Pāñji* and the *Bhaktibhāgavata*.

The Kesarī dynasty is referred to in the *Bhaktibhāgavata* composed in 1510 A.D. by Kaviḍiṇḍima Jivadeva-ācārya who was the preceptor of the Sūryavamśī Gajapati king Pratāparudra (1497-1540 A.D.). While describing his ancestry, etc., in thirty-six stanzas at the end of the work, Jivadeva of the Vatsa-gotra states that his forefathers were the spiritual guides of the kings of Utkala belonging to the Bhoja family, the Kesarī dynasty, the Gaṅga family and the Sūrya-vamśa. In this list, the earliest name Bhoja seems to be a mistake for Bhauma (i.e. Bhauma-Kara) since the kings of the Bhoja-vamśa are described as *Virajā-pada-padma-bhakta* (devotees of the lotus feet of Virajā) and this Virajā, called the *Śakti* (i.e. the Mother-goddess) worshipped in that land (*tad-deśa-śakti*), is no doubt the celebrated goddess of the same name installed at Jāipur which is known to have been the capital of the Bhauma-Kara kings of Orissa.⁷

The change of Bhauma to Bhoja in the tradition of Jivadeva's family may be due to a confusion with the name of the great Paramāra king Bhoja (c. 1000-55 A.D.) of Malwa. It is interesting to note in this connection that the name of king Bhoja occurs, along with that of Vikramāditya of Indian folklore, among the early rulers of Orissa as known from the *Mādala Pāñji*.⁸ Of course, Vikramāditya, the traditional founder of the Vikrama-samvat of 58 B.C., is mentioned as the successor of Bhoja and both are assigned to the period before the foundation of the Kesarī dynasty, about the beginning of the sixth century A.D., by Yayātikesarin whose name reminds us of the fact that Caṇḍihara Mahāśivagupta Yayāti III (c. 1025-55 A.D.), the father of Uddyotakesarin, was the first ruler to have consolidated Somavamśī authority in the Puri-Cuttack region.⁹

It has to be noticed that, while the *Bhaktibhāgavata* mentions the Bhoja family before the Kesarīs or Later Somavamśīs, the *Mādala Pāñji* refers to a king named Bhoja having flourished before the Kesarīs. Thus, though neither of the sources is accurate, the priestly tradition of the *Mādala Pāñji* looks worse confounded than the Vatsa family tradition in the *Bhaktibhāgavata*. Again, the *Mādala Pāñji* does not mention Uddyotakesarin, while the *Bhaktibhāgavata* speaks not of Yayātikesarin but of *Uddyotakesari-kula*, though it may be regarded as doubtful whether the author meant

5. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, p.266, text line 29 ; p. 268, text line 66.

6. There are numerous such cases. For a Yādava king (1271-1311 A.D.) called Rāma, Rāmadeva, Rāmāñj (Rāmarāja) and Rāmacandradeva, see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 199ff. ; Vol. XXXV, pp. 50ff. The word *deva* is an honorific suffixed to royal names.

7. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 180.

8. *Ed. A.B. Mahanti*, p. 4.

9. Cf. Sircar in *The Struggle for Empire*, ed. Majumdar, pp. 209ff.

'Uddyotakesarin's family' or 'the glorious Kesari dynasty'. In any case, if the *Mādala Pāñji* borrowed the reference to Kesari dynasty from the *Bhaktibhāgavata*, as P. Acharya suggests,¹⁰ it is inexplicable whence the priest compilers got the name of Yayātikesarin and why they mention king Bhoja instead of the Bhoja dynasty, even if the absence of Uddyotakesarin known from the supposed source of their chronicle may be explained away. It is therefore difficult to subscribe to the view that the *Mādala Pāñji* borrowed the name of the Kesari family from Jivadeva's *Bhaktibhāgavata*.

Both the *Mādala Pāñji* and the *Bhaktibhāgavata* apparently drew upon tradition in their own way, the former depending on the tradition prevalent among the priests of the Puri temple and the latter on that current in the author's family. This is also suggested by other facts, e.g. (1) the great importance attached in the chronicle to Gaṅga Anaṅgabbhīma (i.e. the Eastern Gaṅga monarch Anaṅgabbhīma III, 1211-39 A.D.), but his total omission from Jivadeva's account; (2) the issue of gold coins bearing the figure of Gopāla (i.e. Kṛṣṇa, identified with the god Puruṣottama-Jagannātha) by Gajapati Pratāparudra (1497-1540 A.D.), the most famous Vaiṣṇava king of Orissa, in the *Bhaktibhāgavata*, but not in the *Mādala Pāñji*, even though the latter is especially concerned with the god. As we have suggested elsewhere,¹¹ the *Mādala Pāñji* was compiled when the memory of even the Sūryavamśi Gajapatis had become dim, that is to say, long after the composition of the *Bhaktibhāgavata*. But the priest compilers of the chronicle apparently had no inclination to gather material from literary sources, but merely depended on hearsay and imagination.

Most of the stanzas at the end of Jivadeva's *Bhaktibhāgavata* were translated by H. P. Shastri¹² and were discussed recently by K. Kar in two little known publications.¹³ We are inclined to analyse the contents of these stanzas here since we are not in agreement with all the views of Shastri and Kar. But, before taking up that subject, it is necessary to say a few words about the literary merit of the *Bhaktibhāgavata*. Jivadeva calls his poem a *mahā-kāvya*, while Kar describes it as a 'great work' and observes, "the epic is a very fine piece of literature and can well compare with the *Naiṣadha*, the masterpiece of poet Śrīharṣa. Its style is lucid and fascinating and its descriptions are true to life."¹⁴ A study of the thirty-six stanzas quoted by Kar has, however, led us to believe that, even if Jivadeva was a great *bhakta* deserving a title like *Bhaktadīndīma* and even if his work may be called 'great' because it deals with *bhakti* which is regarded by some as a great subject, the *Bhaktibhāgavata* is devoid of any literary merit. The author's poor style is demonstrated by many defects including frequent repetition of the same expressions, e.g. (1) *Kesari-kula* in verses 6, 7 and 9; (2) *Gaṅg-ānvaye* in verses 11, 13 and 16; (3) *Kavirājarāja* in verses 23 and 30; (4) *Puruṣottamendre* in verses 24 and 26; (5) *Viṣṇupadī* in

10. See *JAS*, Vol. IV, 1962, No. 1, p. 22.

11. See below; also *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 233ff.

12. *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 1901-1906, pp. 14-16.

13. *Nava Bhārata* (Oriya), Vol. VI, pp. 221ff., 293ff.; *Utkal University Souvenir*, 1948, pp. 108ff.

14. Cf. *Utkal University Souvenir*, p. 108.

verses 27 and 34 ; (6) *prathita* in verses 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11 and 16. and (7) *Śrī Jīvadeva-Kaviḍḍima-panḍitendra* in verses 30 and 36. Indeed, passages like—

Gaṅg-ānvaye samabhavan=prathitā nṛpāla

Vats-ānvaye hi guravo viditā hi teṣām

are mere prose versified with difficulty and scarcely suit 'a fine piece of literature'. It is a pity that the *Kaviḍḍima*, also called *Kavirājarāja* and *Paṇḍitendra*, was so miserably short of suitable words that he had to employ the meaningless *hi* twice in a single foot of the above-quoted section of a stanza in *Vasantalilaka* which is the metre of all the thirty-six verses without exception. It is difficult to believe that the poverty of the style is a characteristic only of these verses and not of the entire work.

Verse 1 speaks of 'the husband of Lakṣmī' (i.e. the god Viṣṇu identified with Puruṣottama-Jagannātha of Puri) who is worshipped in the triple form on the slope of the Nīlācala (the Blue Mountain) on the shore of 'the salt sea' (i.e. the Bay of Bengal). There are many 'Blue Mountains' in different parts of India ; but the reference here is to the low range of sand-hills on which the Puri temple is situated.

Verse 2 mentions the land of Utkala as the home of Vaiṣṇavas devoted to the said god.

Verse 3 states that, in the above-mentioned country, there were once kings belonging to the Bhoja (*sic*—Bhauma, i.e. Bhauma-Kara) dynasty, who were devoted to Virajā, an aspect of the Mother-goddess (*Śakti*) worshipped there. As already indicated, Virajā is the goddess of Jāipur on the Vaitaraṇī river, which is called Virajā-tīrtha, the land stretching for ten miles around the locality being known as Virajā-kṣetra.¹⁵ The same stanza also says that there was a family of Brāhmaṇas belonging to the Vatsa-gotra, who were the spiritual guides of the said rulers and were honoured by them. It is not impossible that the Brāhmaṇa family hailed from Jāipur.

Verses 4-5 introduce Mrtyuñjaya, one of the above-mentioned Vatsa-gotra Brāhmaṇas, as a great teacher and as an expert in the *āgamas*. He is stated to have brought back to life a dead (or nearly dead) son of a king apparently of the Bhoja (*sic*—Bhauma-Kara) family. Unfortunately the name of the king is not mentioned. It is, however, not impossible that Mrtyuñjaya was accepted by the king as the latter's preceptor as a result of the said miracle. This seems to be supported by the following stanza stating that the Vatsa-gotra Brāhmaṇas, who increased Mrtyuñjaya's family, became the spiritual guides of the kings of the Bhoja (*sic*—Bhauma-Kara) dynasty. It further says that the said Brāhmaṇas were devotees of 'the half of Hara's body' (i.e., the Mother-goddess, probably meaning Virajā of Jāipur) and were adepts in incantations and in the performance of magic. These Brāhmaṇas appear to have been Śākta Tantrikas.

Verse 6 states that the Bhojas (*sic*—Bhauma-Karas) lost their throne, as if owing to their rude behaviour towards those Brāhmaṇas, and the Kesarī family came to adorn it. The Vatsa-gotra Brāhmaṇas, honoured by the Bhojas (*sic*—Bhauma-Karas) [as their preceptors], became, in the same way now, the spiritual guides [of the Kesarī dynasty].

15. See N.L. Dey, *Geographical Dictionary*, p. 38 ; Sircar, *The Śākta Pīthas*, pp. 19, 21, 32, 45, 99.

Verse 7. Bhavadeva, one of the Vatsa-gotra Brāhmaṇas, became the preceptor of Uddyotakesarin's family (or the glorious Kesarī dynasty). The author may have really intended to say that, among the Later Somavamśis, Uddyotakesarin first became the disciple of Bhavadeva. The latter half of the verse mentions Someśvara as responsible for the glorification of the family, probably meaning the Kesarī dynasty, though the relationship between Bhavadeva and Someśvara is not indicated.

H. P. Shastri translates the verse as follows: "One Bhavadeva, with great spiritual powers, was the spiritual guide of Uddyotakesarin, who consecrated the phallic emblem of Śiva named Someśvara, which was a Vāṇaliṅga and which was worshipped by all kings." This can be regarded as an inaccurate rough translation of the stanza if the word *vanśaḥ* at the beginning of the last foot is read as *liṅgaḥ*. In case the reading *liṅgaḥ* is supported by any manuscript, it may be regarded as better since it absolves the poet from the charge of introducing Someśvara without disclosing his relationship with Bhavadeva and suggests that Bhavadeva installed a Śivaliṅga called Someśvara apparently for his royal disciples (cf. *nrpa-kulasya samarcaniyo*). But we do not understand whence Shastri got the reference to a Vāṇaliṅga consecrated by Uddyotakesarin.

Verse 8. The first half of the stanza seems to state that the Brāhmaṇa Bhavadeva (if the disputed word of the previous verse is *liṅgaḥ*) or Someśvara (if the said word is *vanśaḥ*) wrote a popular Tantra text entitled *Tantrārṇava*, while the latter half says that the same Brāhmaṇa installed many deities at Kṛttivāsa-kṣetra, i.e. modern Bhubaneswar. Shastri failed to note the reference to Bhubaneswar in the stanza.

Verse 9. When the kings of the Kesarī dynasty were destroyed by the fire of injustice done to the Brāhmaṇas [of the Vatsa-gotra], members of the Gaṅga family, who were devoted to the gods and Brāhmaṇas, became kings.

Verse 10 introduces Coḍagaṅga as an adept in spells and a favourite of the Mother-goddess (*Śakti*, probably meaning Virajā), and rightly as the first of the Gaṅga rulers since it was he who annexed the Puri-Cuttack region to the Gaṅga empire before 1112 A.D. It is also stated that the Vatsa-gotra Brāhmaṇa Gaurīguru was the preceptor of the said Gaṅga king. In this connection, it requires to be noted that Coḍagaṅga is represented in his earlier records as a devotee of Maheśvara (Śiva) and in his later epigraphs as a votary of Viṣṇu (Puruṣottama-Jagannātha).¹⁶

It seems that the capital of Utkala remained at Jāipur for some time even after the Gaṅga conquest, though the Gaṅga capital was later transferred to Cuttack on the foundation of Abhinava-Vāranaśī-kāṭaka at the site by Anaṅgabhīma III.¹⁷ That 'Jāipur' (Yayātipura) was the capital of the Later Somavamśis in Utkala is not only indicated by its name coined after Yayāti (no doubt Yayāti III), but also by the fact that the Ratnagiri plates of Kaṛṇa were issued from Yayātinagara=Yayātipura=Jāipur, called Abhinava-Yayātinagara in the *Madala Pañji*.¹⁸

Verse 11 suggests that the god Nṛsimha was born in the Gaṅga family as Jagadekamalla, the destroyer of Bhillī (*sic*—Dillī, i.e. Delhi). The reference is to

16. See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 240.

17. See Sircar, *Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, pp. 147-48; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 247-48.

18. Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 271-72.

Narasimha I (1139-64 A.D.) since his epithet *lāṅgula-cumbita-tanu*, probably suggesting that his sectarian mark looked like the figure of a tail, reminds us of his epithet *Lāṅgula* or *Laṅguḍā* as found in the *Mādala Pāñjī*. His epithet or secondary name Jagadekamalla and the claim of his success against the Delhi Sultān are not met with elsewhere, though the latter may be due to a confusion with the well-known story of his success against the Muslim ruler of Lakṣmaṇavatī (Bengal).¹⁹

Shastri's translation has, 'In the Gaṅga dynasty was born Lāṅgulīyā Nṛsimha whose body had a tail.'

Verse 12 states that the preceptor of the said Gaṅga king was the Vatsa-gotra Brāhmaṇa Ācāryarāja whose descendants had been settled by the king at Kāśī where they were still continuing when the *Bhaktibhāgavata* was composed in 1510 A.D.

Verse 13 introduces another Gaṅga king named Nṛsimha (apparently Narasimha II, 1278-1305 A.D.) who is described as an adept in composing poems and as the builder of the lofty temple of Koṇārka. Since the celebrated Sun-temple at Koṇārka (Koṇarak) is known to have been built by Gaṅga Narasimha I, the ascription of the achievement to Narasimha II is no doubt due to a confusion.

Verse 14. The first half of the stanza states that the preceptor of the second Narasimha was the Brāhmaṇa Vāmadeva who was devoted to Vāmadeva (Śiva).²⁰ The latter half says that Vāmadeva's younger brother Hari was the *Praharādhirāja* [of the king].

H.P. Shastri thinks that Hari was the king's 'commander of the guards'. But *Praharādhirāja* is the same as the Oriya Brāhmaṇical family name *Praharāja*, which was originally a title probably conferred on the astronomer-cum-astrologer at the royal court who calculated the auspicious and inauspicious character of the divisions of a day.²¹

Verse 15 states that Vāmadeva renounced his palatial buildings, temples, tanks, numerous rent-free holdings as well as his poetical compositions and obtained *siddhi*.

Verse 16 speaks of a Gaṅga king named Bhānu who died as the result of excessive drinking. Although it is difficult to determine whether he is identical with any of the earlier kings named Bhānu or is the same as Bhānu IV mentioned in the following stanza, we do not understand why Shastri translates the latter half of the verse as : 'Bhānu was their last king who, being addicted to women, perished.'

Verse 17 speaks of Niḥśaṅka Bhānu (i.e. Bhānu IV, who was ousted by Kapilendra, the founder of the Sūryavaṁśī Gajapati family, in 1435 A.D.) as intoxicated with pride and says that the Gaṅga dynasty having declined owing to the fickleness of that king, the solar family reappeared (i.e. the Sūryavaṁśī Gajapatis, claiming descent from the ancient solar dynasty of Kosala, obtained the kingdom). Shastri speaks of the solar race being supported by the nobility of the land. But *kulapuruṣa* in the stanza seems to mean 'the progenitors of the family'.

19. Ray, *DHNI*, Vol. I, pp. 480ff.

20. The Vaiṣṇava saint Nārāharitīrtha was the guardian of Narasimha II during the early years of his reign. See Mahtab, *The History of Orissa*, Vol. I, 1959, p. 239.

21. See above, p. 133 ; also *An. Bhand. Or. Reg. Inst.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 219-20.

Verse 18-19. The first stanza introduces Gajapati Kapilendra (Kapileśvara) as the conqueror of the earth, while the following verse states that, Gopādeva having renounced the world, his younger brother Vāsudeva of the Vatsa family became the preceptor of the Gajapati king.

Verse 20 states that the king bestowed land and money to the Brāhmanas and jewels to the temple on the Nīlagiri (i.e. the Puri temple) and died on the bank of the Veṇī (i.e. the Kṛṣṇaveṇī or Kṛṣṇā) after having ruled for thirty-two years (1435-67 A.D.). Shastri wrongly regards the Veṇī as identical with Triveṇī.

Verse 21 introduces Puruṣottama as the son of Kapilendra and refers to his enjoyment of the goddesses of both fortune and learning.

Verse 22 states that Puruṣottama conquered Vidyāpurī (i.e. Vijayanagara) and bestowed jewels and gold to the Brāhmanas. A similar tradition about Puruṣottama's conquest of Vidyānagara (Vijayanagara, but Rajahmundry according to some) is noticed in certain Bengali Vaiṣṇava works, e.g., Kṛṣṇadāsa's *Caitanyacaritāmṛta*.²² The stanza also refers to Puruṣottama's poetical compositions.

Verse 23. King Puruṣottama's preceptor was *Kavirājarāja* Trilocana, the son of the above-mentioned Gopāla whom Shastri wrongly regards as an ancestor of Trilocana.

Verses 24-25 speak of the death of the king and his preceptor. The king obtained the world of Viṣṇu near the Citrotpalā (i.e. the Mahānadī) after a rule of thirty years (1467-97 A.D.), while Trilocana went to the world of the god Puruṣottama by means of *yoga* practised on the *mukti śilā*. Shastri wrongly translates the passage *adhyāsa muktikara-mukti-śilām* as 'lived on *mukti-śilā*, the giver of salvation'.

Verse 26 states that, on Puruṣottama's death, his son Vīrarudra (i.e. Pratāparudra) became king. The last foot of the stanza suggests that Vīrarudra (Pratāparudra) ascended the throne when he was seventeen years old. The real name of the king was Rudra (cf. verse 31), though he was often called Vīrarudra and Pratāparudra which are shortened forms of Vīrapratāparudra or Pratāpavīrarudra.

Verse 27 says that the king, having defeated the ruler of Gauḍa (i.e. the Sultān of Lakṣmaṇavatī) shortly after his coronation, performed the water-offering ceremony for his deceased father in the river Viṣṇupadī (i.e. the Ganges—in West Bengal) within three fortnights [of his father's death]. This seems to suggest that Pratāparudra's encounter with the Bengal Sultān was earlier than his expeditions against the Vijayanagara kingdom. This has escaped the notice of recent writers on Gajapati history.²³

Shastri wrongly translates the latter part of the stanza as "at the end of the sixth week of his father's death, he offered handfuls of Ganges water for the benefit of his father."

Verse 28 states that, although the king's soul was purified by the theory of non-dualism, he preached dualism in respect of the incarnation of Vasudeva's son (i.e. Kṛṣṇa). Shastri speaks of 'the dual doctrine at the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa (Caitanya)'.

22. Subrahmanyam, *The Sūryavaṃśī Gajapatis of Orissa*, p. 184.

23. See, e.g., Mukherjee, *The Gajapati Kings of Orissa*, pp. 72ff.; Mahtab, *The History of Orissa*, p. 325. Cf. also Subrahmanyam, *op. cit.*, pp. 90ff.

Verses 29-30 These two stanzas have been treated by Shastri as verses 30 and 29. The first of these verses states that new gold coins bearing the figure of Gopāla (i.e. Kṛṣṇa) and the king's name, issued by Vīrarudra (Pratāparudra), were circulated in the countries on all sides, while the king's compositions were read by all scholars. No coin of the king has, however, so far been discovered. The second stanza says that *Kaviḍiṇḍima* Jivadeva, also called *Kavirājarāja* and 'the prince among scholars', who was the son of the above-mentioned Trilocana from the latter's wife Ratnāvatī and was extremely devoted to the god Kṛṣṇa, became the spiritual guide of the Gajapati king.

Verses 31-32. The first of the two stanzas states that when Rudradeva (Pratāpudra or Vīrarudra) was staying at Veṅkaṭ-ādri (probably the same as Vaṅkaṭa-giri in the Nellore District and not Tirupati in the Chittur District, both in Andhra Pradesh) for the conquest of the Karnaṭa country (i.e. the Vijayanagara kingdom), the work (i.e. the *Bhaktibhāgavata*) was composed by the *Śiṅhra-kavi* (i.e. Jivadeva). The next stanza says that the great work (*mahā-prabandha*) was composed in the month of Makara in the seventeenth *Aṅka* (i.e. fourteenth regnal year=1510 A.D.) of the king when the poet was just in his thirty-fifth year and was staying near the Godāvarī.

There is difference of opinion on the question whether king Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijayanagara became involved in war with the Gajapati immediately after his accession in 1509 A.D. or shortly after 1512 A.D.²⁴ The presence of Pratāparudra at Veṅkaṭ-ādri in connection with a war with Karnaṭa in 1510 A.D. seems to go in support of the former view.

Verses 33-36. These are not of any historical importance. In the last of these stanzas, *Kaviḍiṇḍima* Jivadeva, 'the prince among scholars', claims to have been capable of composing a work in one *prahara* (three hours) and of refuting six different philosophical views alone, though such boasts do not quite suit the traditional modesty of a Vaiṣṇava.

The verses discussed above are followed by a passage in prose recording the completion of the *mahā-kāvya* entitled *Bhaktibhāgavata* by *Vyavaharī-Mahāpātra Kaviḍiṇḍima Gajarāja-rājaguru* Jivadev-ācārya who was the son of *Vyavaharī-Mahāpātra Kaviṇāja Rajaguru* Trilocan-ācārya.

It may be pointed out that some scholars speak of Jivadeva having received the title *Kaviḍiṇḍima* from the Gajapati king on account of his *Bhaktibhāgavata*.²⁵ Although this is not supported by the stanzas discussed above, Jivadeva's other work, discussed below, seems to throw light on the point.

II

The other work of Jivadeva is the Sanskrit drama entitled *Bhaktivaibhava*, a manuscript of which is preserved in the Asiatic Society's library and has been noticed by H.P. Shastri in *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. VII, pp 274-78 (No. 5347). An examination of this second composition of Jivadeva of course confirms our views regarding the poor quality of his literary merit.

In the introductory section of the *Bhaktivaibhava*, the Vaiṣṇava author of the drama describes himself in the words put in the mouth of the *Sūtradhāra*. There are

24. See, Mukherjee, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-78. Cf. Subrahmanyam, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

25. Mukherjee *op. cit.*, p. 5.

certain boastful claims in this description, which do not appear to be in good taste for a proverbially modest Vaiṣṇava. The stanza, *ekah param racayitum praharat=prabandham*, etc., in which the author claims to have been capable of composing a poetical work in one *prahara*'s time and of refuting six different philosophical views alone, is found in this section, and it is the same as the last verse in the colophon of Jivadeva's other work, the *Bhaktibhāgavatā*.

In another stanza in the same vein, the *Sūtradhāra* exclaims at the strangeness of the phenomenon of *kavitva* and *pāṇḍitya* residing in Jivadeva as friends without any clash. A third verse in this part runs as follows :—

*aṣṭau hātaka-camarāṇi kanaka-cchatraṁ ḍamaḍ-ḍiṇḍimaṁ
yo labdhvā prathita-pratāpa-vibhava-śrī-Rudradev-eśvarāt/
śrī-Jivāḥ Kaviḍiṇḍima nṛpa-guruḥ ṣaḍ-darśanī paṇḍito
bhakti-prasthita-deśiko='khila-kal-ālankāra-dikṣā-guruḥ ||*

As regards the composition of this stanza, the third foot is rather prosaic, while the repetition of the word *guru* in the same sense in the third and fourth feet is not in good style. However, the verse gives us the interesting information that Jivadeva obtained eight golden fly-whisks, one golden umbrella and a drum from king Rudradeva (i.e. Pratāparudra). Since this information is not found in the stanzas in the colophon of the *Bhaktibhāgavatā* (1510 A.D.), is it possible to think that the poet had received the title *Kaviḍiṇḍima* sometime before the honour of enjoying the music of the *ḍiṇḍima* or drum was conferred on him? This may also mean that the *Bhaktivaibhava* was composed sometime after 1510 A.D., a fact that seems to be indicated by another evidence as we shall see below. In any case, we are reminded, in this connection, of the title *Kaviḍiṇḍima* enjoyed by the poet Rājanātha who composed the *Saḷva-bhyudaya* on the life of Saḷva Narasiṃha (1485-93 A.D.) of Vijayanagara, as also of the honour of the enjoyment of the music of certain musical instruments, known as the *pañca-mahāśabda*, which was often conferred by the kings on subordinates and dignitaries.

In the colophon of the *Bhaktivaibhava*, the author is sometimes mentioned simply as *śrīmat-Kaviḍiṇḍima-Rājaguru Jivadev-ācārya*; but sometimes we have *śrīmat-Kaviḍiṇḍima-Rājaguru Trilocaṇ-ācārya-tanaya-śrī-Bhagavad-Vāsudeva-bhakti-prasthāna-praṇayana-param-ācārya-śrīman - Mahāmahopādhyāya - śrī Kaviḍiṇḍima-Vāhinīpati-Rājaguru-śrī-Jivadev-ācārya*. His titles *Mahāmahopādhyāya* and *Vāhinīpati* are not noticed in the *Bhaktibhāgavatā* (1510 A.D.) and appear to have been conferred on him by his royal patron Pratāparudra at a later date. This fact also seems to indicate that the *Bhaktivaibhava* was composed later than the *Bhaktibhāgavatā*. The expression *Vāhinīpati* literally means 'a leader of the forces'. But, in medieval Orissa, the title seems to have been conferred by the rulers on civilians as well, and *Vāhinīpati* is a well-known family name among the Brāhmaṇas of Jāipur in the Cuttack District of Orissa. The title *Mahāmahopādhyāya* was sometimes enjoyed by scholars of the medieval age; e.g. *Mahāmahopādhyāya Mahādev-ācārya* of the Śeṣam family, who was the court Pandit of the Redḍi king Prolaya Vema (c. 1325-53 A.D.) of Koṇḍaviḍu and was the seventh ancestor of Lolla Lakṣmīdhara, the court Pandit of Pratāparudra Gajapati of Orissa.²⁶

The following stanza occurs in the manuscript of the *Bhaktivaibhava* in the Asiatic Society's library at the end after the colophon :

*Ekonaṭṛiṃśad-aṅke kṣiti-valaya-bala-dveṣiṇaḥ śrī-Mukund-ā-
bhikhyasya khyāta-kirteḥ rajata-Haridine Bhādra-māse='hni Saure/
ko='pi Kṣaunīsuparvā samalikhad=amalaḥ Bhaktimad-Vaibhav-ākhyam
mukhy-ārtham nāṭakan=tat=kavivara-pariṣad-garva-sarvasva-guptim ||*

The verse contains the date when a certain Brāhmaṇa (*ko='pi Kṣaunīsuparvā*) completed the manuscript of the drama entitled *Bhaktivaibhava* (*Bhaktimad-Vaibhav-ākhyam nāṭakam*). The year is given as the twenty-ninth Aṅka of the heroic personage named Mukunda and the details of the day are quoted as *rajata-Hari-dine Bhādra-māse='hni Saure*, i.e. Saturday, the eleventh *tithi* of the bright fortnight of the lunar month of Bhādra (Bhādrapada). Thus the manuscript was completed on Saturday when the *tithi* was the eleventh of the bright half of Bhādrapada in the twenty-ninth year of the Aṅka reckoning of a king named Mukunda, i.e. Mukunda's Aṅka year 29, Bhādrapada-sudi 11, Saturday. P. Acharya has drawn our attention to another manuscript of the *Bhaktibhāgavata* in the Utkal University Library at Bhubaneswar, in which we have *asita-Hari-dine Bhādra-māse='hni Saure*, giving the date as Saturday of the dark half of the month of Bhādra.²⁷ According to Acharya, Mukundadeva belonged to the Bhoi dynasty of Khurda and ruled in 1659-89 A.D. (although Orissa came under Mughul supremacy as early as 1592 A.D.) so that the 20th Aṅka (24th regnal year) corresponded to 1682 A.D. and the dates Bhādra-sudi 11 and Bhādra-vadi 11 would be respectively the 19th August and the 2nd September in that year.

III²⁸

*Asti praśasti-lalito Lavaṇ-ābdhi-tīre
Nīlācal-añcala-taṭī-mukuta-āyamaṇaḥ/
ekas=trimūrti-kuhanā-kṛta-citra-mūrtir=
Lakṣmīpatiḥ sakala-daivata-vandanīyaḥ//1
Tat-pāda-padma-tūlasī-dala-saṃprasūta-
saurabhya-hūta-harid-antara-Vaiṣṇav-āliḥ/
deśaḥ sa Utkala iti prathitaḥ pṛthivyām
nirvyāja-bhukti-sakha-mukti-samartha-hetuḥ//2
Tasmin=nṛpāḥ samabhavan=kila Bhoja-varṇśyās=
tad-deśa-śakti-Virajā-pada-padma-bhaktāḥ/
taiḥ pūjitā vimala-Vatsa-kula-prabhūtaḥ
kecin=nṛpāla-guravaḥ prathitā dvijendraḥ//3
Mrtyuñjayaḥ samabhavat=prathitaḥ sa teṣāṃ=
ācārya-varya-caraṇaḥ sakal-āgamajñāḥ/
yaḥ pañcatām=upagatām narapāla-sūnum
mṛtyum vijitya sahasā punar=ānināya//4*

27. Loc. cit.

28. For the text of the colophon, of the *Bhaktibhāgavata*, see *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Vol. IV, 1962, No. 1, pp. 23ff.; also *Nava Bhārata* (Oriya), Vol. VI, Nos. 5, pp. 221ff.; and 6, pp. 293ff.; *Utkal University Souvenir*, 1948, pp. 108ff. Misprints in the published text have been removed in our transcript.

Vatsya Har-ardha-tanubhāga-pad-abja-sevaḥ
khyātās=tadīya-kula-vṛddhikarā babhūvuh/
Bhoj-ānvaya-kṣitibhṛtām guravaḥ pavitra
mantr-aika-sādhana-parā bhuvi yajajukāḥ//5

Bhojeṣu teṣv=avinayad=iva rāja-pīṭhad=
bhraṣṭeṣu Keśari-kulam tad=alamcakāra/
tair=arcitā dvija-varā guravas=tath=aiva
jātā jagat-prathita-Vatsa-sagotrīṇas=te//6

Uddyotakeśari-kulasya gurur=babhūva
teṣu prasiddha-mahimā Bhavadeva-nāmā/
Someśvaro nṛpa-kulasya samarcanīyo
vaṁśaḥ sa tena kṛtin=aiva kṛta-pratiṣṭhaḥ//7

Yen=oddhr̥te sakala-vīṣṭṛta-yantra-sāre
tantr-āṇave mahati majjati sarva-lokaḥ/
Yat-sthāpit-āmara-kulair=iha Kṛttivāsa-
kṣetram babhūva vata tad=vipual-āvakaśam//8

Bhūpeṣu Keśari-kula-prabhaveṣu teṣu
vipr-āpakāra-dabanaiḥ pralayaṁ gateṣu/
deva-dvijāti-pada-paṅkaja-cañcarikā
bhūpā babhūvur=atha kēcana Gaṅga-vaṁśyaḥ//9

Teṣv=ādimah samabhavad=dhṛta-mantra-siddhiḥ
Śakti-prasāda-paramo bhuvi Codagaṅgaḥ/
Gaurīgurur=gurur=abhūt=prathito='sya Vatsa-
vaṁśe guruḥ Sura-pater=iva tantra-cittah//10

Gaṅg-ānvaye samucite='vatatāra tasmin
deva-prasāda-rasiko bhagavān=Nṛsimhaḥ/
Dillī-vibhañjana-canaḥ prathit-ānubhavo
lāṅgula-cumbita-tanur=jagadeka-mallaḥ//11

Ācāryarāja iti Vatsa-sagotra-sindhu-
śītadyutiḥ samabhavad=gurur=asya rājñah/
ady=api yat-kula-bhava'nivasanti Kāśyāṁ
śrīman-Nṛsimha-narapāla-kṛta-pratiṣṭhaḥ//12

Gaṅg-ānvaye krama-vaśad=udiyāya tasmin
khyato Nṛsimha nṛpatih kavita-dhurīṇah/
Koṇarka-devasadanam ghaṭayāmbabhūva
yah ketu-daṇḍi-paṭa-tāḍita-nāka-lokam//13

Tasy=abhavad=gurur=asau vidit-ānubhavaḥ
śrī-Vāmadeva iti pūjita-Vāmadevaḥ/
Karn-ātīśayi-mahimā bhuvi dāna-śaundo
yasy=ānujo Harir=abhūt=praharādhiraḥ//14

Prāsāda-maṇḍapa-saraḥ-śata-śāsanāni
bhūmau nidhāya nija-kāvya-kath-āmṛtāni/
śrī-Vāmadeva-caraṇo vapuṣ=aiva tena
siddho babhūva samudañcita-yoga-siddhiḥ//15

Gaṅg-ānvaye samabhavan=prathitā nṛpālā

Vats-ānvaye hi guravo viditā hi teṣāṃ/

Bhānur=babhūva nṛpa-śūratamaḥ sa teṣu
yo vāruṇī-parihṛto='stamito babhūva//16

Niḥśaṅka-Bhānu-nṛpatau mada-ghūrṇamāne
tac-cāpalān=nipatite bhuvi Gaṅga-vamśe/
bhūyo dhṛto guṇa-gaṇaiḥ kula-puruṣāṇām=
ucchiśriye Kamalabāndhava-tuṅga-vamśaḥ//17

Tatr=ābhavad=Gajapatiḥ Kapilendra-nāmā
prauḍha-pratāpa-bhara-nirjjita-caṇḍa-dhāmā/
nirjitya sarva-dharaṇīdhara-vāraṇ-endrān
pṛthvīm vaśam=akṛta yo guṇa-rajyamānām//18

Gopāladeva-sumatau nṛpa-sevanāyām
vairāgya-bhāji bhava-bhoga-virakta-citte/
jajñe gurur-Gajapater=anujas=tadīyaḥ
śrī-Vāsudeva iti Vatsa-kul-āvataṁsaḥ//19

Dattva dvijāya sa nṛpo dharaṇī-dhanāni
ratnāni Nilagiri-kandara-maṇḍirāya/
dvātrimśad-abdam=upalāya dharām sva-dharmair=
Venī-taṭe Bhagavato='ntikam=āsasāda//20

Tasy=ātmaḥ Gajapatiḥ Puruṣottamo='bhūl=
līl-āvatāra-Puruṣottama eva sāksāt/
Lakṣmīm samāna-madhura-praṇayena Vāṇīm
yas=tulyam=eva caturo ramayāmbabhūva//21

Vidyāpurīm bhuja-balena vijitya devo
ratnāni kāñcana-cayam dvijasāc=cakāra
yasy=ānan-endu-rasa-kāvya-sudhām pibanto
bhūmīsurā na kalayanty=amṛt-ābhilāṣam//22

Gopāla-dugdha-jaladher=uditāḥ sudhāṁśus=
tasy=ābhavad=gurur=asau gaṇanīya-kīrtiḥ/
śrīmat=Trilocana-sudhīḥ kavirāja-rājah
khyāto gabbīratara-śāstra-vicāra-dhīraḥ//23

Dān-oddhure Gajapatau Puruṣottam-endre
kīrtya jaganti sudhaya dhavalāni kṛtvā/
trimśat=samāḥ samabhinandya dharām bhujābhyām
Citrotpalā-parisare padam=āpa Viṣṇoḥ//24

Śrīmat-Trilocana-gurur=gurur=asya rājño
yāgān=vidhāya vividhān=api śāsanāni/
adhyāsa muktikara-mukti-śilām sa yogaiḥ
śalokyam=āpa sahasā Puruṣottamasya//25

Svar-loka-bhoga-rasike Puruṣottam-endre
tasy=ātmaḥ suratarur=bhuvi Vīra-Rudrah/
bhart=ābhavat=samucito dharaṇer=navīnaḥ
saundarya-saptadaśa-vatsara-Matsyaketuḥ//26

sadyo='bhiṣeka-salilaiḥ kṛta-maulir=eva
 saṅkhye vijitya raṇa-jitvara-Gauḍa-rājam/
 nadyām nivāpa-salilena sa Viṣṇupadyām
 prātarpayat=prthu-yaśaḥ pitaram tripakṣe//27

Yo vaiṛi-pakṣa-paritakṣaṇa-dakṣa-dīrgha-
 dor-daṇḍa-pālita-mahī-valayo narendrah/
 Advaita-vāda-parisuddhatar-antar-ātma
 dvaitam tanoti Vasudeva-sut-āvatāre//28

Gopāla-mūrti-rucirā nava-hema-mudrā
 yan-nāma-varṇa-likhan āṅkana-bhasan ānaḥ/
 sarvāsu dikṣu viharanti yadīya-sūkti-
 muktāś=ca kaṇṭha-kubare sudhiyām luṭhanti//29

Tasy=ābhavad=gurur=asau Kavirāja-rājah
 śrīmat-Trilocana-nṛpāla-guroḥ=tanujah/
 śrī-Jivadeva-kavi-diṇḍima-paṇḍit-endro
 Ratnāvati-śīsur=anārata-Kṛṣṇa-bhaktah//30

Śrī-Rudradeva-nṛpatāv=atha Veṅkaṭ-ādrau
 Kaṇṭha-deśa-vijayena vasaty=udāre/
 ten=āśya śīghra-kavinā jagad-īśvarasya
 kāvyam nibaddham=idam=ujjvala-bhakti-siddham//31

Āṅke='sya saptadaśake nṛpateḥ sa-ṛaṇca-
 trimś-abda-cumbita-vayaḥ kaviḍiṇḍimo='yam/
 Godāvati-parisare nivasann=akārṣin=
 māsenā tatra Makareṇa mahā-prabandham//32

Vijñasya duṣaṇam=api sprhaṇīyam=eva
 kanta-adhara-prati-rada-kṣatavad=bibhati/
 aty-ādaro='pi kuṭilasya khalasya n=eṣṭo
 vyālasya cumbanam=iva prathamam bhayānām//33

eṣa kṛtiḥ sukṛtibhir=mama śīlanīya
 Kṛṣṇasya pāda-tulasī-dāla-śītal=eti/
 ratnākarāḥ kati na santi tath=āpi Śarvaḥ
 sarv-ottame śirasi Viṣṇupadīm bibharti//34

Tebhyo namo='stu bhava-vāridhi-jīrṇa-paṅka-
 samlagna-mokṣaṇa-vicakṣaṇa-pādukebhyaḥ/
 Kṛṣṇ-eti-varṇa-yugala-śravaṇena yeṣām=
 ānandathur=bhavati nartita-roma-vṛkṣaḥ//35

Ekah param racayitum praharāt=prabandham=
 ekah param ṣaḍ=api khaṇḍayitum matāni/
 śakto Mukunda-pada-paṅkaja-cintanena
 śrī-Jivadeva-kaviḍiṇḍima-paṇḍitendraḥ//36

Iti śrīmad-Vyavaharī-Mahāpātra-Kavirāja-Rājaguru-śrīmat-Trilocanadev-
 ācārya-tanaya-śrīmad-Vyavaharī-Mahāpātra-Kaviḍiṇḍima-Gajarāja-rājaguru-
 Jivadev-ācārya-viracitam Bhaktibhāgavatam mahākāvyam//

CHAPTER XVI

Pre-Sūryavaṁśī Orissa in the Mādālā Pāñji

The unreliable nature of the *Mādālā Pāñji* has been briefly discussed above in connection with Jivadeva's *Bhaktibhāgavata*. The question is dealt with in greater detail in the following pages.

Scholars who have dealt with the history of Orissa have naturally referred to the accounts of the *Mādālā Pāñji*, the Oriya chronicle of the celebrated Jagannātha temple at Puri in Orissa. There are various versions of the work usually conflicting with one another. It has not always been noticed, at least in Orissa, that the above characteristic of the chronicle detracts much from whatever value it may have as a historical composition. The work claims to sketch the history of Orissa from the earliest times theoretically, but from the sixth century A.D. with a show of seriousness, down to quite recent times. But the Jagannātha temple was built by the great Gaṅga monarch Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga (1078-1147 A.D.)¹ and the chronicle prepared on behalf of the priests of this temple can by no means be regarded as a contemporary account of Orissan history between the sixth and the eleventh century. Whether, however, the early part of the chronicle reflects any genuine tradition handed down from olden times is apparently a matter of investigation. Another matter of enquiry, if the chronicle was written at a particular date and was periodically supplemented thereafter, is no doubt whether this gradual growth can be attributed to specific dates with the help of manuscripts. Unfortunately, a special study of the *Mādālā Pāñji* on the basis of the existing manuscript material was only rarely and imperfectly done, while a critical edition of the work was never attempted. Moreover, whatever small sober work has been done in this direction is almost completely ignored by the Oriya writers on the history of their country.

The first three royal families of the post-fifth century history of Orissa (with special reference to the Puri region where the Jagannātha temple is situated), dealt with by the *Mādālā Pāñji*, are (1) the Kesarī dynasty, from the sixth to the twelfth century A.D., (2) the Gaṅga dynasty, from the twelfth century to the fifteenth, and (3) the Solar dynasty, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Now, the history of Orissa from the foundation of the Sūrya-vaṁśa or Solar dynasty by Kapilendra about 1435 A.D. is fairly well known. The chronology of the Sūryavaṁśīs and their successors as found in the different versions of the chronicle are very often conflicting and erroneous,

1. JASB, Vol. LXVII, 1898, pp. 328-31 ; Journ. Or. Res., Vol. XVII, pp. 209ff.

although the genealogy is fairly reliable. The accepted genealogy of the *Sūryavaṁśī*s is as follows : (1) Kapilendra ; his son (2) Puruṣottama ; and his son (3) Pratāparudra. This is supported by the chronicle. But the different versions of the work are not unanimous in regard to the chronology of the three rulers. According to one version, Kapilendra, Puruṣottama and Pratāparudra ruled respectively for 32, 30 and 36 years, but according to a second version for 27, 25 and 28 years respectively, while a third version suggests that the reigns of the three kings fell respectively in the periods Śaka 1374-1432 (1452-83 A.D.), Śaka 1402-26 (1480-1504 A.D.) and Śaka 1426-54 (1504-32 A.D.).² But the actual reign-periods of Kapilendra, Puruṣottama and Pratāparudra are known to have fallen respectively in the periods, c. 1435-67 A.D. (about 32 years), c. 1467-97 A.D. (about 30 years) and c. 1497-1540 A.D. (about 43 years).³ This single fact would suggest that the present day versions of the *Mādala Pāñji* were compiled even considerably after the *Sūryavaṁśī*s of Orissa. When the chronicle is wrong in its chronology of the medieval *Sūryavaṁśī*s, it is of course too much to expect correctness in its accounts of the earlier dynasties. It can be easily demonstrated now with the help of the definitely known facts of early Orissan history based on epigraphic evidence that the *Mādala Pāñji* account of the pre-*Sūryavaṁśī* history of Orissa is hopelessly wrong both in regard to genealogy and chronology. As a matter of fact, no Kesari dynasty is known to have ruled in Orissa. More than half a century ago, when the reconstruction of early Orissan history from epigraphic sources was just at the initial stage, J. F. Fleet pointed out⁴ that the kings Yayātikesarin and Janamejayakesarin of the so-called Kesari-vaṁśa of the chronicle are no other than the kings Yayāti Mahāśivagupta I and Janamejaya Mahābhavagupta I of the Soma-vaṁśa or Lunar dynasty of South Kosala and Utkala. These two kings are assigned by the chronicle to the sixth and eighth centuries A.D.⁵ Actually, however, both the Somavaṁśī kings, viz. Janmejaya Mahābhavagupta I and his son Yayāti Mahāśivagupta I flourished in the tenth century.⁶ Fleet showed the utter unreliability of the genealogical and chronological scheme of the *Mādala Pāñji* and remarked that everything relating to ancient times, which had been written on the unsupported authority of these annals, has to be expunged bodily from the pages of history. This view was supported by the independent researches of M. M. Chakravarti⁷ who pointed out that the texts of the chronicle are found full of mistakes and cannot be relied upon unless corroborated by other evidence. Since Fleet and Chakravarti offered their opinions on the subject about three quarters of a century ago, many new inscriptions have been discovered and we are in a better position to demonstrate the absurdity of the *Mādala Pāñji* account of the pre-*Sūryavaṁśī* history of Orissa. About half a century ago, R.P. Chanda⁸ made another serious attempt to determine the historical value of the accounts of the chronicle and ascribed their origin to the Mughul period. Our knowledge of early Orissan history has become fairly complete during the years that have passed since Chanda wrote on the subject. We now know

2. See *Mādala Pāñji*, ed. A.B. Mahanti, introductory lists, p. 9.

3. Cf. Banerji, *History of Orissa*, Vol. I, pp. 289, 305 ; Sewell, *Historical Inscriptions of Southern India*, p. 373.

4. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. III, 1894-1895, pp. 335ff.

5. Mahanti, *loc. cit.*, pp. 1-2.

6. *IHQ*, Vol. XXII, p. 307.

7. *JASB*, Vol. LXVII, 1898, Part I, pp. 376-79.

8. *JBORS*, Vol. XIII, 1927, pp. 10-27.

that the Somavaṃśīs (called the Kesarīs in the chronicle) ruled over Lower Orissa from the eleventh to the twelfth century when they were overthrown by the Gaṅgas. Before the Somavaṃśīs, it was under the rule of the imperial dynasty of the Bhauma-Karas who flourished from the ninth to the eleventh century, but about whom the chronicle is absolutely silent. Apparently its compilers were totally ignorant of the events of Orissan history earlier than the tenth century. Before the rise of the Bhauma-Karas, the heart of Orissa was successively under the Imperial Guptas of Magadha, the Vīgrahas who were originally viceroys of the Guptas, the Mānas, the Gauḍas and the Śailodbhavas. About 643 A.D. Orissa for a few years passed to Harṣavardhana of Kanauj. The chronicle is naturally quite ignorant of these dynasties, although it claims to trace Orissan history seemingly with seriousness from the sixth century. There is hardly any doubt that it began to be compiled at a time when there were in the country, only faint echoes of traditions regarding the past rule of some kings having names ending with the word *kesarin* (such as Uddyotakesarin and his grandson Karnaḥakesarin) as well as of a few kings like Janamejaya and Yayāti.

That the *Mādala Pāñji* began to be compiled long after the end of Gaṅga rule in the fifteenth century is clear from the many unaccountable errors in its story of the Gaṅgas in regard to both their genealogy and chronology, although vague traditions regarding the rule of several kings of this dynasty must have been then prevalent in the country. It is also interesting to note that owing to the comparative proximity of time, the Gaṅgas were slightly better remembered than the earlier rulers. It is therefore rather strange that, even at the present time, there is some confusion in the minds of Oriya scholars in regard to the historical value of the chronicle. This is clear from the remarks of A. B. Mahanti in the Oriya introduction of his edition of the work which is based mainly on three versions and was published from Cuttack in 1940 under the patronage of the Government of Orissa. Mahanti says, "From king Madana-mahādeva (who is fourth in succession from Coḍagaṅga according to the chronicle) to Mukundadeva I. i.e., from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, the accounts contained in the *Mādala Pāñji* are quite true and reliable (*sampūrṇa satya* and *viśvāsa-yogyā*)."⁹ He also believes that the chronicle has been continuously written since a date following the reign of Coḍagaṅgadeva, i.e. Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga, 1078-1147 A.D.¹⁰ Unfortunately, no arguments of any sort have been adduced in favour of such statements. It is unfortunate that Mahanti is silent about the views of writers like Fleet, Chakravarti and Chanda, referred to above.

Of the three versions of the *Mādala Pāñji* quoted by Mahanti in his work, which may be styled A, B and C for the sake of convenience. A is older than B which is again earlier than C. This is suggested by the manner of their quoting the reign periods of particular rulers. Let us take up the case of the semi-mythical Yayāti-kesarin with whom the account of the seemingly serious portion of the chronicle begins.¹¹

A—*e rājā bhoga kale va 57 rasa* (i.e., 'this king reigned for 57 years').

B—*e rājā bhoga kale a 84 ṅkaru va 68 rasa* (i.e. 'this king reigned for 84 Aṅka years corresponding to 68 actual years').

C—*e rājā bhoga kale va 52 rasa—Sa 448 kabda paryanta* (i.e., 'this king reigned for 52 years [from Śaka 396] to Śaka 448, i.e., from 474 to 526 A.D.').

9. *Op. cit.*, p. ii.

10. *Ibid.*, p. iii.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Apart from the hopeless discrepancy in the number of years in the three accounts, it is clearly seen that B exhibits an attempt at improvement upon A, while C exhibits a similar attempt to improve upon B. A speaks of the reign period in actual years; but B does it also according to the Aṅka system of reckoning. We know that the Aṅka method of reckoning was introduced by the successors of Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga and that it became popular long after that monarch's time. It is, however, not our intention to say that A had been compiled before the Aṅka system was known or popular, because the same A actually refers to the Aṅka years in connection with Yayātikesarin himself.¹² But it certainly shows that its compiler, in mentioning reign periods only in actual years, offered an opportunity to the compiler of B to improve upon his account by quoting both actual as well as Aṅka years. Again C is seen to have improved upon both A and B by referring to the ending Śaka years of particular reigns. Of course there is no question of any genuine tradition involving the use of the Śaka era in a sixth century date in Orissan history coming down to the chronicler, as the use of this era was introduced in the country by the Imperial Gaṅgas about the end of the tenth century A.D. However, it shows that the compiler of C was eager to improve upon other versions of the chronicle by quoting the periods of particular reigns with reference to the Śaka era.

What has been said above would show that of the versions of the *Mādala Pāñjī* quoted by Mahanti, A is the earliest. But we have seen how it refers to the Aṅka reckoning showing thereby that its compilation is considerably later than the time of Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga who ended his rule about the middle of the twelfth century. Fortunately, there is another clue in the language of A suggesting that it could not have been compiled before the end of Gaṅga rule three centuries later.

There is an interesting passage in A, quoted by Mahanti at pp. 27-28 of his work. This passage forms a part of the description of one of the many Gaṅga kings named Anaṅgabhīma, who is assigned a reign period of 27 years.¹³ B and C also agree in ascribing the same length of reign to the king in question, the former quoting 33 Aṅka years as corresponding to the said period and the latter equating the last year of the reign with Śaka 1124, i.e. 1202 A.D.¹⁴ Thus the above Gaṅga king named Anaṅgabhīma is suggested to have ruled from Śaka 1097 to Śaka 1124, i.e. in 1175-1202 A.D. The length of the reign recorded, viz., 27 years, seems to suggest that this Anaṅgabhīma is Anaṅgabhīma III who ruled for 27 years actually, however, in the period c. 1211-38 A.D.¹⁵ We have to note that tradition in this case seems to have a partially historical basis. But the more interesting fact about the description of this king, referred to above, is concerning its language and style.

The passage runs as follows: ... *Śrī-navare bije kari mudala karaile | e mudalara bhāṣā Śrī-vīra Śrī-Gajapati-Gauḍeśvara-navakoṭi-Karnāṭa-Kalavarageśvara abhirāe bhyta-bhairava dusahaduśāsana anikaraṇe rāutarāe atula-bala-parākrama-saṅgrāma-sahasrabāhu-dhūmaketu Śrī-Anaṅgabhīmādeva-mahārajāṅkara virala a 15*

12. Cf. loc. cit. : e mahārājā a 13 nke Kakarā-di 25 ne siṅghāsana bije karaile.

13. Ibid., p. 32.

14. Ibid., p. 34.

15. Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, p. 501. For the genuineness of a few other traditions regarding this king, see *Orissa Historical Research Journal*, Vol. I, pp. 39ff.

nka Śrahi Phagūṇa-śukla da 10 mī tat-kāla ekādaśī Guruvāre Śrī-Puruṣottama kṛtāke Śrī-navara-dakṣiṇa-ghare dev-ārccana-avakāṣe Abhinava-Yayātinagara-Viṣṇu Śrī-pāda-mudale pura caurī navare bāṅkiāre bije-samaya pāṣe pātra-paramahansa-vājapei-Dāmodara-purohita mahāpātra-Nilakanṭha-rāeguru mahāpātra-Balabhadra-praharāja mahāpātra-Cāini-pāṭayoṣi mahāpātra-Dāmodara-paṇḍa pātra-Gaṅgādhara-paṇḍa pātra-Cakradhara paṇḍa pātra-Vidyādhara paṇḍa pātra-Jagannātha-paṇḍa pātra-Nilakanṭha-paṇḍa pātra-Bhimakara-paṇḍa pātra-Gopīnātha-paṇḍa pātra-Balabhadra-paṇḍa pātra-Purīdāsa-miśra Jenā-Ba'arāe-Narasimghadeo Ajayadeo parirāe-Ananta-deo parirāe-Īśvaradeo parirāe-Śatrudeo parirāe-Hariharadeo parirāe-Ramadeo pora-pāñjidhara-parikṣā-Mithuni-paṇḍa pora-Śrīkarāṇa-Surūya-puranāyaka Mārakaṇḍa Mahāsenāpati samasta pātra khaṇṭi/ buḍhālenkā thāi ṭhakure purūna hoi manta boli tarapa karāile/

The passage quoted above would interest any student of Orissan epigraphy owing to the similarity of its style with that of inscriptions and the use of certain expressions in common with medieval epigraphic records. The words *navara* and *bije* are Oriya corruptions of Sanskrit *navara* and *vijaya*, although the latter has been used in its modified Oriya sense of 'presence', 'march', etc. It is interesting to note that both the words *navara* as well as *vijaya* in its Oriya sense are found in medieval Orissan records beginning with the copper-plate grants of Narasimha II (c. 1278-1305 A.D.). The word *mudala* is used in the chronicle in the sense of 'arrangement made or to be made according to order'. It is found in the same sense in the Puri plates of Narasimha IV (c. 1379-1410 A.D.). It is, however, originally a Telugu word meaning 'order' and is found exactly in this original sense in the charters of Narasimha II and his son. The use of the word *mudala* in the modified Oriya sense in the passage quoted above seems to suggest that it may have been composed sometime after the rule of Narasimha II. This suggestion is possibly supported by the use of the word *pāṣe* (Sanskrit *pārśve*) in the style of the charters of Narasimha IV and not of those of earlier Gaṅga rulers like Narasimha II and Bhānu II (c. 1305-27 A.D.). *Parikṣā* (Oriya *parichā*) is found in the earlier records usually under the form *parikṣaka* and only rarely as *parikṣa*, but in the records of Narasimha IV usually as *parikṣā*. Designations like *Buḍhālenkā* are found in the charters of Narasimha IV, but not in earlier records. Family names or official designations like *Parirāe* as well as the reference to too many Paṇḍās in the list of officials appear to suggest for the passage a date even later than Gaṅga Narasimha IV. The expression *pora* prefixed to the designations of *pāñjidhara-parikṣā-Mithuni-paṇḍa* and *śrīkarāṇa-Surūya-puranāyaka* is found in the form of *puro* in the charters of Narasimha II and Bhānu II and in that of *poro* in the grants of Narasimha IV.^{15a}

From what has been said above, it would appear that the passage quoted from version A of the chronicle could not have been composed much earlier than the fourteenth century. But more decisive in this connection is the king's

15a. See the grants of Narasimha II and Bhānu II. The Puri plates of Bhānu II and the first of the three sets of the Kendūpatna plates of Narasimha II have been published in *JRASB*, Letters, Vol. XVII, 1951, pp. 33ff., while the Kendūpatna plates (sets II and III) of Narasimha II have appeared in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 185ff. See also the Asankhali and Alalpur plates of Narasimha II and the Puri plates (B) of Narasimha IV in the same journal, Vol. XXXI, pp. 104ff., pp. 11ff.; Vol. XXVIII, pp. 30ff. It is a matter of regret that Mahanti never attempted to explain any archaic word occurring in the *Mudala Pāñji*. It is equally curious that the voluminous *Pramoda Abhihāna* (Cuttack, 1942) does not recognise expressions like *mudala*, *pora*, etc., although they are found in the Oriya Chronicle.

title *Gajapati-Gauḍeśvara-navakoṭi-Karṇāṭa-Kalavargeśvara* representing the Gajapati or imperial ruler of Orissa as the lord of Gauḍa or Bengal, 'the Karṇāṭa 9 crores' (i.e., the dominions of the Vijayanagara emperors), and Gulbarga (the kingdom of the Bahmani Sultāns of Gulbarga and Bidar) which was introduced in Orissan history and epigraphy by the Sūryavaṁśīs for the first time. It is thus quite clear that, even in the earliest version consulted by Mahanti, the description of the Gaṅga king Anaṅgabhīma, who ended his rule in the first half of the thirteenth century, could not have been composed until considerably after the foundation of the Sūrya-vaṁśa two centuries later. There is therefore hardly any doubt that even the account of the Gaṅgas in the *Mādala Pāñji* was compiled long after the end of Gaṅga rule in Orissa. This account again seems to be based on traditions, only rarely genuine, about certain Gaṅga kings, which were prevalent in the country at a later period and not on any definitely reliable source such as a written document.

To demonstrate the conflicting and absolutely unreliable nature of the *Mādala Pāñji* evidence in regard to the genealogy and chronology of the so-called Kesari dynasty and the Imperial Gaṅga family (beginning with Anantavarman Codagaṅga), it is only necessary to quote Mahanti's list of these kings, given in the introductory part of his work, side by side with that of the kings of the heart of Orissa (the chronicle being especially concerned with the Puri region), who are known to have actually reigned in the period concerned.

MĀDALĀ PĀNJĪ

Kesari Dynasty

(from the sixth to the twelfth century)

1. Yayāti, 57 or 68 or 52 years or up to Śaka 448 (526 A.D.).
2. Sūrya, 30 or 26 or 57 years or up to Ś. 505 (583 A.D.).
3. Ananta, 14 or 24 or 40 years or up to Ś. 545 (623 A.D.).
4. Lalāṭa, 40 or 54 or upto Ś. 599 (677 A.D.).
5. Kanaka, 24 or 17 or 16 years or upto Ś. 615 (693 A.D.).
6. Nara or Ananta, 13 or 18 or 8 years or upto Ś. 623 (701 A.D.).
7. Gaṅga or Padma, 25 or 19 or 5 years or upto Ś. 628 (706 A.D.).
8. Vṛddha or Dhruva, 40 or 9 years or upto Ś. 637 (715 A.D.).
9. Vaṭa, 26 or 15 or 11 years or upto Ś. 648 (726 A.D.).
10. Gaja or Rāja, 25 or 12 years or upto Ś. 660 (738 A.D.).
11. Vasanta, 2 years or upto Ś. 662 (740 A.D.); *not mentioned in all the versions.*
12. Gandharva or Kṛṣṇa, 17 or 14 years or upto Ś. 676 (754 A.D.).
13. Janamejaya or Gaṇa, 14 or 9 or 8 years or upto Ś. 685 (763 A.D.).
14. Bharatha, 25 or 15 years or upto Ś. 700 (778 A.D.).
15. Kavi, 27 or 12 or 14 years or upto Ś. 724 (802 A.D.).
16. Kāma, 24 or 16 or 19 years or upto Ś. 733 (811 A.D.).
17. Kosala, 25 or 18 years or upto Ś. 751 (829 A.D.).
18. Caṇḍa, 17 years or upto Ś. 768 (846 A.D.).
19. Pracāṇḍa, 14 or 19 years or upto Ś. 787 (865 A.D.).
20. Dhruva or Dhruma or Amṛta, 22 or 10 years or upto Ś. 797 (875 A.D.).
21. Vijaya, 22 or 10 or 15 years or upto Ś. 812 (890 A.D.).

22. Caṇḍapāla, 18 or 12 or 14 years or upto Ś. 826 (904 A.D.).
23. Madhusūjana, 12 or 10 or 16 years or upto Ś. 842 (920 A.D.).
24. Dharma or Bhauma, 27 or 19 or 10 years or upto Ś. 852 (930 A.D.).
25. Jaya, 30 or 7 or 11 years or upto Ś. 863 (941 A.D.).
26. Nṛpa, 19 or 14 or 12 years or upto Ś. 875 (953 A.D.).
27. Makara or Marakata, 5 or 6 or 14 years or upto Ś. 889 (967 A.D.).
28. Tripura or Ghaṭa, 18 or 10 years or upto Ś. 899 (977 A.D.).
29. Mādhava or Madana, 14 or 12 years or upto Ś. 911 (989 A.D.).
30. Govinda, 8 or 7 or 10 years or upto Ś. 912 (990 A.D.).
31. Nṛtya or Anaṅga, 14 or 6 years or upto Ś. 935 (1013 A.D.).
32. Narasiṁha, 12 or 11 years or upto Ś. 946 (1024 A.D.).
33. Kṛṣṇa or Rāma, 18 or 10 or 6 years or upto Ś. 956 (1034 A.D.).
34. Gokaṛṇa, 15 years ; *not mentioned in all the versions.*
35. Maccha, 17 or 8 or 16 years or upto Ś. 972 (1050 A.D.).
36. Varāha, 21 or 14 or 15 years or upto Ś. 987 (1065 A.D.).
37. Vāmana, 13 years or upto Ś. 1000 (1078 A.D.) ; *not mentioned in all the versions.*
38. Paraśu or Rāja, 2 or 17 years or upto Ś. 1002 (1080 A.D.).
39. Candra, 15 or 6 or 12 years or upto Ś. 1014 (1092 A.D.).
40. Sujana or Yadu, 8 or 7 years or upto Ś. 1021 (1099 A.D.).
41. Mālatī or Bhuvana, 9 or 5 years or upto Ś. 1026 (1104 A.D.).
42. Purañjaya or Bhīma, 3 or 8 years or upto Ś. 1029 (1107 A.D.).
43. Vasukalpa or Lakṣmaṇa, 12 or 7 years or upto Ś. 1041 (1119 A.D.).
44. Indra or Ghaṭa, 3 or 4 or 5 years or upto Ś. 1045 (1123 A.D.).
45. Dhruva or Vasanta, 1 year ; *not mentioned in all the versions.*
46. Śūnya, 3 or 9 years or upto Ś. 1054 (1132 A.D.) ; *not mentioned in all the versions.*

Gaṅga Dynasty

1. Cuḍagaṅga, 62 or 24 or 20 years or upto Śaka 1074 (1152 A.D.).
2. Gaṅgeśvara, 9 or 12 or 14 years or upto Ś. 1088 (1166 A.D.).
3. Ekajaṭā Kāma, 7 or 12 or 5 years or upto Ś. 1093 (1171 A.D.).
4. Madana-Mahādeva or Rājarājeśvara, 15 or 26 or 4 years or upto S. 1097 (1175 A.D.).
5. Araṇḍabbhīma, 27 years or upto Ś. 1124 (1202 A.D.).
6. Rājarājeśvara or Bhīmasena 10 or 35 or 25 years or upto Ś. 1159 (1237 A.D.).
7. Lāṅgulā Narasiṁha, 26 or 18 or 45 years or upto Ś. 1204 (1282 A.D.).
8. Kavi or Vīra Narasiṁha, 25 years or upto Ś. 1229 (1307 A.D.).
9. Pratāpa Narasiṁha, 31 or 20 years or upto Ś. 1249 (1327 A.D.).
10. Kavikānta or Kavikānta Narasiṁha or Vīrakharakāla Narasiṁha, 1 year or 2 or 9 years or upto Ś. 1251 (1329 A.D.).
11. Kajalā or Sakhi Narasiṁha, about 1½ months or 1 year or upto Ś. 1252 (1330 A.D.).
12. Śaṅkhabhānu Narasiṁha, 17 or 7 years or upto Ś. 1259 (1337 A.D.).
13. Niḥśaṅka Bhānu, 16 or 24 years upto Ś. 1283 (1361 A.D.) ; *not mentioned in all the versions.*
14. Balī Bhānu, 26 or 21 years or upto Ś. 1304 (1382 A.D.),

15. Vīra Bhānu, 2 or 12 or 19 years or upto Ś. 1323 (1401 A.D.).
16. Kali Bhānu, 14 or 10 or 13 years or upto S. 1336 (1414 A.D.).
17. Akatā-akātā Bhānu, 14 or 30 or 15 years or upto Ś. 1351 (1429 A.D.).
18. Matta Bhānu, 23 or 14 years or upto Ś. 1374 (1452 A.D.).

SOBER HISTORY OF ORISSA

[based on epigraphic sources]*(sixth and seventh centuries)*

The Imerial Guptas; their Viceroys who later became independent rulers; the Mānas; the Gaudas and the feudatories of the Gauda kings; Harṣavardhana.

Prthivivigraha, Gupta year 250 (569 A.D.).

Lokavigraha, G. 280 (599 A.D.).

Śambhuyaśas, G. 260 (579 A.D.), G. 283 (602 A.D.).

Śaśāṅka of Gauda (c. 600-25 A.D.), G. 300 (619 A.D.).

Harṣavardhana [of Kanauj] in Orissa, c. 643-44 A.D.

Śailodbhava Dynasty*(from the seventh to the ninth century in the Puri area)*

1. Sainyabbhīta Mādhvavarman II Śrīnivāsa, c. 610-65 A.D.
2. Ayaśobbhīta Madhyamarāja I, son of No 1; c. 665-95 A.D.
3. Dharmarāja Mānabhīta. son of No. 2; c. 695-730 A.D.
4. Madhyamarāja II, son of No. 3 ; c. 730-50 A.D.
5. Raṇakṣobha, son of No. 4; c. 750-70 A.D.
6. Allaparāja, son of the paternal⁷ uncle of No 5; c. 770-800 A.D.
7. Madhyamarāja III, c. 800-35 A.D.

Bhauma-Kara Dynasty*(from the ninth to the eleventh century)*

The era used by these kings started from 831 A.D. See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, pp. 297ff.; also *IHQ*, Vol. XXIX. pp. 148-55.

1. Lakṣmīkara or Kṣemaṅkara. The names may be of two different persons also.
2. Śivakara I Unmatṭasimha Bharasaha, son of No. 1.
3. Śubhākara I, son of No. 2.
4. Śivakara II, son of No. 3.
5. Śāntikara I Gayāḍa, son of No. 3 ; year 93 (924 A.D.).
6. Śubhākara II, son of No. 4 ; year 100 (931 A.D.).
7. Śubhākara III Kusumahāra Simhadvaja, son of No. 5 ; year 103 (934 A.D.).
8. Tribhuvanamahādevī. mother of No. 7 ; year 120 (951 A.D.).
9. Śāntikara II Gavaḍa Lonabhāra, son of No. 7.
10. Śubhākara IV Kusumahāra, son of No. 9 ; year 145 (976 A.D.).
11. Śivakara III Lalitahāra, son of No. 9 ; year 149 (980 A.D.).
12. Prthvīmahādevī *alias* Tribhuvanamahādevī, wife of No. 10. year 158 (989 A.D.).
13. Śāntikara III, son of No. 11.
14. Śubhākara V, son of No. 11.
15. Gaurī, wife of No. 14.

16. Dāṇḍimahādevī, daughter of Nos. 14-15 ; year 180 (1011 A.D.), 187 (1018 A.D.).
17. Vakulamahādevī, wife of No. 14.
18. Dharmamahādevī, wife of No. 13.

Soma-vamśa or Lunar Dynasty

(from the eleventh to the twelfth century in Lower Orissa)

- [1. Śivagupta.
2. Janamejaya Mahābhavagupta I (c. 935-70 A.D.), son of No. 1.
3. Yayāti Mahāśivagupta I (c. 970-1000 A.D.), son of No. 2.
4. Bhīmaratha Mahābhavagupta II (c. 1000-15 A.D.), son of No. 3.
5. Dharmaratha Mahāśivagupta II (c. 1015-20 A.D.), son of No. 4.
6. Nahuṣa Indraratha Mahābhavagupta III (c. 1020-25 A.D.), son of No. 4.]
7. Caṇḍibara Yayāti Mahāśivagupta III (c. 1025-60 A.D.), great-grandson of No. 2 ; *first ruler of lower Orissa*,
8. Uddyotakesarin Mahābhavagupta IV (c. 1060-80 A.D.), son of No. 7.
9. Janamejaya [Mahāśivagupta IV] (c. 1080-90 A.D.), son of No. 8.
10. Purañjaya [Mahābhavagupta V] (c. 1090-1100 A.D.), son of No. 9.
11. Karṇa (or Karṇakesarin) Mahāśivagupta V (c. 1100-10 A.D.), younger brother of No. 10. He seems to have been extirpated by Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga.
- [12. Abhimanyu of Kosala (South Kosala), c. 1080-1105 A.D.
13. Someśvara of Paścira-Laṅkā, c. 1105-15 A.D.]

Gaṅga Dynasty

(from Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga)

1. Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga, c. 1078-1147 A.D. He seems to have conquered the Puri-Cuttack region from Karṇa or Karṇakesarin of the Soma-vamśa.
2. Kāmārṇava, c. 1147-56 A.D., son of No. 1.
3. Rāghava, c. 1156-70 A.D., son of No. 1.
4. Rājārāja I, c. 1170-90, A.D. son of No. 1.
5. Anaṅgabhīma II, c. 1190-96 A.D., son of No. 1.
6. Rājārāja II, c. 1196-1211 A.D., son of No 5.
7. Anaṅgabhīma III, c. 1211-38 A.D., son of No. 6.
8. Narasiṃha I, c. 1238-64 A.D., son of No. 7.
9. Bhānu I, c. 1264-78 A.D., son of No. 8.
10. Narasiṃha II, c. 1278-1305 A.D., son of No. 9.
11. Bhānu II, c. 1305-27 A.D., son of No. 10.
12. Narasiṃha III, c. 1327-52 A.D., son of No. 11.
13. Bhānu III, 1352-78 A.D., son of No. 12.
14. Narasiṃha IV, 1379-1410 A.D., son of No. 13.
15. Bhānu IV, 1410-35 A.D.; son (?) of No. 14. He was overthrown or succeeded by Kapilendra, founder of the Surya-vamśa.

It will be seen from the above lists that, while the chroniclers had scarcely any authentic information at all about the history of Orissa prior to the conquest of Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga about the beginning of the twelfth century, they had some vague information about the Gaṅgas. The account of the so-called Kesari dynasty is no

doubt entirely fabricated on the basis of the very vague echo of traditions regarding past kings having names ending with *kesarin* and including kings named Yayāti, Janamejaya and Purañjaya. The great number of omissions and commissions in the account of the Gaṅgas (especially the curious multiplication of the Narasimbas and Bhānus, the two groups being wrongly placed one after another) can be clearly seen from a comparison of the *Mādala Pāñji* list with the authentic list quoted one after the other. The relations that the Gaṅga kings mentioned in the chronicle bore to one another have been given in the work although they have not been indicated in the list compiled by Mahanti and quoted by us. It may be summarily pointed out that the indications of the Chronicle in this connection are opposed to epigraphic evidence and are absolutely unhistorical. A word may be said here about the list of the Kesari and Gaṅga kings compiled by Mahanti from the different versions of the chronicle and quoted by us above. By comparing it with the text of *Mādala Pāñji* versions quoted by him, we find some inaccuracies. But it is needless to point them out in detail as the lists themselves are hardly of any real importance to the student of history.

Before conclusion, it may further be pointed out that the *Mādala Pāñji* traditions regarding the Gaṅgas are of the nature of folklore. This is clearly seen from various passages, especially from the accounts of Coḍagaṅga and of his occupation of Orissa, quoted [from A] by Mahanti at pp. 21 ff. of his work. The utter absurdity of these legends will be apparent to anybody who will care to compare them with the definitely established facts about this king that have been gathered from epigraphic sources. The chroniclers did not know that Coḍagaṅga, described as *rāṇḍi-puā*, i.e., a poor widow's son, was himself a powerful ruler with his capital at Kalinganagara (modern Mukhalingam near Srikakulam) before his conquest of Orissa and that his immediate predecessors were mighty monarchs. It may be noted in this connection that *rāṇḍi-puā* Anata¹⁶ is famous in Oriya folklore as the only worthless son of a poor Brāhmaṇa widow. The washer-woman called Netāi, introduced in Coḍagaṅga's story, is well known in Bengali folklore of the late medieval period as Nityā or Nitāi. The mention of a Paṭhāna (i.e., a Pushtu-speaking Musalman) in the same context is again extremely suspicious and suggestive of a late date of the composition. It is unnecessary to continue the demonstration of the nature of what one may call a mere farrago of legends and myths of no authority. R.P. Chanda is no doubt right when he says, "as the foreigners who invaded Orissa in the fifth century A.D. are called Mughals (in all the versions of the chronicle), it may be safely concluded that the sections relating to the pre-Mughal period of these texts were first compiled in the Mughal period."

16. Cf. *Pramoda Abhidana*, s.v.

CHAPTER XVII

Two Bengali Documents of the Eighteenth Century

About the end of June, 1962, I happened to visit the gallery of the Directorate of Archaeology, Government of West Bengal, 33 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 12. My attention was there drawn to an exhibit which is a paper document bearing the signature of Rāṇī Bhavānī and addressed to Mahārājā Nandakumār, two of the most illustrious names in the modern history of Bengal.

The document is written in Bengali characters as prevalent about the eighteenth century, the language being Bengali which is, however, characterized by the use not only of a few passages in Sanskrit, but also of a large number of words of Arabic and Persian origin. It is not very easy to read and interpret correctly records exhibiting such styles of writing and expression, especially in view of the fact that some of the foreign words are used in modified senses.

About the same time, my attention was also drawn to another document bearing the signature of Mahārāṇī Bhavānī, a photograph of which appeared in the Bengali weekly journal called *Desh* (*Deśa*), dated the 30th June, 1962 (15th Āṣāḍh, 1369 B.S.), p. 883, as an illustration in an article entitled 'Rāṇī Bhavānīr Dalil' (A Document of Rāṇī Bhavānī) by Chittapriya Mitra at pp. 883-87. In spite of the title of Mitra's article, it really contains very little about the record itself—neither its text nor any interpretation thereof. As regards the text, Mitra quotes only five words from the document, in which also there are errors of both reading and interpretation. He has correctly read only the date and the name of the addressee.

The records begin with the passage *iyādikirdā* which is modified from Persian *yād kund* or *yād bārd kard* and means 'Be it remembered'. The language of the following section is seemingly Sanskrit, though it abounds in Bengali and Perso-Arabic passages. Often words of different origin have been joined in *samāsa* and *sandhi* as in *karaja-patram*=*idaṁ* (in which *karaja* from Arabic *qarz*, 'a loan') is joined in *samāsa* with Sanskrit *patram*, 'a deed') and *kāryañ=c=age* (in which Sanskrit *kāryañ=ca* is joined in *sandhi* with *age* used in Hindi, Bengali, etc., to mean 'ahead, below, afterwards', the word *kārya* indicating 'the object or subject matter of a document'). The rest of both the records is written in Bengali abounding in Arabic and Persian words used in some cases in modified senses, as indicated above. Thus *śadar* or *sadar* (from Arabic *sadr* generally meaning 'principal') has been used

in the sense of 'current' with reference to a year, in one case with the Bengali locative suffix *te* added to it. For the Bengali verb *dilām* (I am giving), Document I has *dilām* and *dila* and Document II *dilāom* and *dila*, the forms *dilām* and *dilāom* representing different pronunciations of the same word.

As regards orthography, the sibilants are often used indiscriminately without reference to the sound concerned as in *daṣṭabadaṣṭa* for Persian *dast ba dast* (from hand to hand), *śikkā* for Arabic *sikkah* (a current coin), *jiliṣ* for Persian *jalūsī* (the year reckoned from the date of the king's accession), *hāṣil* for Arabic *hāsil* (revenue), *khaliṣā sariphā* for Arabic *khaliṣah sharifa* (the royal exchequer, revenue department), *samil* for Arabic *shāmīl* (included), *samaś* in the geographical name *Samaśkhālī* for Arabic *shams* (the sun), *śāl* for Arabic *sāl* (the year), etc. The reason is that all the sibilants are pronounced as dento-palatal by the people of Bengal. The representation of the sound of English *w* in *beoā* (*bewā*, from Persian *bewa*, 'a widow') and the geographical name *Dhāoā* is in the Perso-Arabic fashion, in which the letter *wāw* stands for *w* as well as *ū* and *o*. It may be noticed that the modern Bengali way of writing these words as *beoyā* and *Dhāoyā* is even more unscientific. The Assamese alphabet has a separate consonant for the sound which should have been borrowed in Bengali. Arabic *lāyaq* (fit) has been written as *lāek* and not in the modern Bengali way as *lāyek*, Document I uses *na* for *ṇa* in all cases while both the records often use medial *i* for medial *ṇ* and *vice versa* not only in foreign but also in Sanskrit words; cf. *jio*, *tihattarī*, *vrkṣādī*, *cārī*, *rānī*, etc. Document II uses Bengali *pād* (Sanskrit *paṭaka*, 'bank') in the form of *pāhād* which normally means 'a hill'.

The palaeography of the documents, which use the Nāgarī type of *anusvāra*, and the Assamese type of *ra* in a few cases where it is distinguished from *ba* is characterized by the use of (1) different forms of the same letters and signs, (2) the same or similar form of different letters, and (3) forms of letters and signs which became gradually obsolete after the introduction of the printing press.

The palaeography of Document II is similar to that of the other record. But the slanting stroke of *ra* distinguishing it from *ba* is sometimes clear in it. It also uses *ṇa* in some cases. The sign looking like *candra-bindu* without the dot in *U sath* (line 13) stands for *śrī-Durgā* written at the top of the sheet or for the word *iśvara*.

An interesting feature in both the documents is that neither bears the signatory's seal and that the Rāṇī's two signatures, which were expected to be identical, are not the same. In Document II, the Rāṇī's name is apparently written by the person who wrote the record. The writer's name is absent in both the records probably to imply that the signatory was herself the writer. But this could hardly have been expected in the case of Document I wherein the record itself is written in an experienced hand while the signature is in a coarse handwriting. This raises the question whether Rāṇī Bhavanī was unable to write her name easily owing to lack of sufficient education or she was careless enough to allow others to write her name on documents. As we shall see below, it was certainly unwise on the Rāṇī's part to issue such documents which could be more or less easily forged.

DOCUMENT I

After the passage meaning 'Be it remembered', the name of the addressee is given as Mahārāja Nandakumār Rāy with *jio* suffixed to it. This *jio* is used now as *jī* or *jū*

in an honorific sense ; cf. also Hindī *pitāji*, *Rāmcandraji*, etc. In Bengali, the son or a person standing in a similar relation is honorifically addressed as *Bābaji* which has also the form *Bābājivan*. It appears that *jio*, etc., are modifications of Sanskrit *jīva* or *jīvana*. After the addressee's name, no word like *saccariteṣu* as found in Document II, is noticed here. In the same context, we have often the word *barābareṣu* in Bengali records, in which the Sanskrit locative plural case-ending is suffixed to the Persian word *barābar* to convey the modified sense of 'addressed to'.

The next passage states that the document is a loan-deed (*karaj patra*) written in San 1173 (given in both figures and words) and that the object (subject-matter) of the deed is going to be narrated in the sequel *kāryañ=c=āge*. In this section, *likhanam*, also found in Document II, should properly be *likhitam* which is generally noticed in such records, while *San 1173 egāra-śao tihattari anke* should correctly be *San egāra-śao tihattari anke 1173*, 'In the year eleven hundred seventy-three, 1173 in figures'. Year 1173 of the Bengali San, which is a modification of the Fasli era, corresponds to 1767-68 A.D.

The subject-matter of the deed is then given in two sentences, the first of which states that the signatory, Rāñī Bhavānī, was transferring to the addressee, Mahārājā Nandakumār Rāy, 251 *bighās* of land styled *arāji haṣil lāek jirāt* and attached to the villages of Munirpur, Rāypur, Makarampur (correctly *Mukarrampur*) and Rāmpurā under the jurisdiction of Taraf Rāmeśvarpur in Parganā Dhāwā, Sarkār Udambar, Mahāl Khālīṣa Sharīfa, lying within her Zamindārī, with *lākhirāj khardigī*. In *arāji haṣil lāek jirāt*, which is Arabic, *jirāt* means 'arable or cultivated land', *haṣil-lāyaq* 'fit for earning revenue' and *arāzī* 'detached plots of land either rent-free or recovered from the retrocession of rivers'. The meaning of the whole expression is 'tax-producing arable lands in detached plots recovered from the retrocession of rivers' and we have actually some villages with names having *arāzī* as a prefix, e.g., *Ārāzī Madhupur* near Berhampur in the Murshidabad District. In *lākhirāj khardigī*, *lākhirāj* means 'rent-free' and *khardigī* is *kharīdagī*, 'ownership by purchase', the whole expression meaning 'right to enjoy tax-free land by virtue of purchase'. Rāñī Bhavānī was transferring, by the deed, her title to 251 *bighās* of rent-free land in favour of Mahārājā Nandakumār Rāy on receipt of Rs. 1,255, i.e. Rs. 5 per *bighā*.

In this section, *maujā* (*mauzā*) means 'a village', *maujehāy majkure*, 'in the above-mentioned villages' (cf. Arabic *mazkur*, 'afore-mentioned') *āmale* 'in the possession or jurisdiction', and *mahāl* 'an estate or assessed property', while *shāmil* and *khālīṣa sharīfa* have already been explained above. Taraf is the subdivision of a Pargana which was itself the subdivision of a Sarkār or district. Sarkār Udambar and Pargana Dhāwā are mentioned in the 'Ain-i-Akbarī. This Sarkār was also called Tāndā or Agmahāl (Rājmahāl) and comprised parts of the present Purnea and Santal Parganas Districts of Bihar and of the Murshidabad District of West Bengal.

The next sentence states that Rāñī Bhavānī received from the addressee 1,255 Rūpaiyās or Rupees as the total amount of price (*mablag pan*) and deposited the money in the Government treasury (*khajānā āmarate*). Arabic *mablagh* means 'a sum', though in Bengali it is generally used in the sense of 'the total sum', while Sanskrit *paṇa* means 'price'. Arabic *khazāna* means 'the treasury', though it is used in Bengali to mean 'revenue or tax'. With *khazāna* in the Arabic sense, *amarat* may

be Persian 'imārat, 'dominion authority', etc. But, if *khājānā* is taken in the Bengali sense, *amarate* may be Persian 'imāra (account) with the Bengali locative case-ending *te* suffixed to it. The Rupee is here called *jilis śikkā* which means the current coin bearing the date in the regnal reckoning of the Mughul emperor (cf. *jalusi* and *sikka* explained above).

The last line means to say that the loan-deed was given by the signatory to the addressee for the purpose stated above and the date was the 11th Caitra of the current year of the Bengal San (*san śadar*). Since the Bengali month of Caitra corresponds to March-April, the date would fall about the end of March, 1768 A.D. The word *iti* is used in the Bengali sense of 'end' both here and in Document II.

The document is signed by Rāṇī Bhavānī and two witnesses, viz.. Lakṣmī-nārāyaṇ Rāy and Mahendranārāyaṇ Rāy, both called *Kānūngoi*. Above the the names of the witnesses occurs the word *isāid* or *isād* derived from Arabic *ishhād*, 'evidence, testimony.'

The word *Kānūngo* really means 'an expounder of law', though in India it became the designation of 'a revenue officer', while *Kānūngoi*, meant 'the office of the *Kānūngo*'. It is difficult to say whether *Kānūngoi* has been used in our record in the sense of a *Kānūngo* or as an official belonging to his office.

It will be seen from the above analysis that, although the document is specifically called a loan-deed drawn by Rāṇī Bhavānī in favour of Mahārājā Nandakumār, it really records the sale of 251 *bighās* of rent-free land by the former to the latter and also mentions the fact that the entire amount was deposited by the Rāṇī in the State treasury in payment of taxes due from her. If the land was mortgaged against the loan, the conditions required to have been clearly stated in the record and it would have been called not a *karaj-patra*, but a *bandhak-patra*. The nature of the document and the fact that two officers of the revenue department were the only witnesses would suggest as if Nandakumār was the chief collector of the State revenue and the Rāṇī, having failed to pay up her dues in time, informally pledged some land to get extra time for making the payment, so that, if only the money was not ultimately paid, the Rāṇī would lose her lands to the State. This would, of course, explain how a sale-deed was represented as a loan-deed. The absence of the Rāṇī's seal on the document might, in that case, have been regarded as immaterial since the witnesses were two revenue officers of the State. In such cases, the money stated to have been borrowed was never paid or received.

But there is a great difficulty in accepting this easy interpretation of the document. Although Nandakumār was the Dewān of Nawāb Mīr Ja'far, he had to retire on the Nawāb's death in 1765 A.D. and the East India Company obtained in that year the Dewānī of the Suba of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa from the Mughul emperor, Shāh 'Ālam II, and appointed Muhammad Reza Khān as the chief collector of revenue of the Bengal region. It thus appears that, in March 1768 A.D., the Rāṇī could have only borrowed the amount from Mahārājā Nandakumār at Murshidābād for payment of her dues in the State treasury, though the revenue officers would have drawn up the document as in the former days when the Mahārājā was the Nawāb's Dewān. Otherwise, we have possibly to think that the record is a forgery which was meant to deprive the Rāṇī of some arable land belonging to her Zamindārī.

Supposing that the record is genuine, two points appear to us as striking. In the first place, it was certainly unwise on the Rāṇī's part to issue it without her seal and the signature of the writer, etc., as such a document could have been easily forged by the revenue officers. It was specially dangerous in view of the fact that the Rāṇī's signature on the record, if it was really hers, looks like that of an uneducated person. Of course, a seal could also have been forged, but apparently with some difficulty.

Secondly, the Rāṇī is found to have failed to pay the small sum of Rs. 1,255 from her own treasury. If this is true, her financial position cannot be regarded as bright. Some of the probable reasons for such a state of affairs are discussed by us under Document II.

TEXT

- 1 iyādikirdda (/*) sakalamaṅgalālaya
- 2 Śrīyuta Mahārāja Nandakumār Rāy jio (/*)
- 3 karaja-patram=idaṁ san 1173 egāra-śao tihattarī
- 4 aṅke likhanam¹ (/*) kāryañ=c=āge (/*) amār jamidari-madhye
- 5 mauje Munirpur o mauje Rāypur o mauje Makarampur
- 6 o mauje Rāmpurā sāmīl taraph Rāmeśvarpur āmale
- 7 pargane Dhāoā sarkār Uḍambar mahāl khālīśā sariphā
- 8 maujebāy majkure āraji hāsīl lāek jirāt
- 9 251 dui-śao ekāṇṇa bighā lakhirāj khardigī dilām² (/*) mablag pan
- 10 1255 mablag bāra-śao pacpanna rūpaiyā jiliṣ śikkā
- 11 daṣṭa badaṣṭa laiṇā khājānā āmarāte dākhil karilām (/*)
- 12 etad=arthe karaj-patra dila³ iti (/*) san śadarate 11 Caitra (/*)

I⁴

- 1 Śrī Rāṇī(ṇī) Bhavāni-⁵
- 2 De[vyā](h*) (/*)

II⁶

- 1 isād
- 2 Śrī Lakṣmīnārāyaṇ
- 3 Rāy Kānungoi (/*)

III⁷

- 1 isād
- 2 Śrī Mahendranārāyaṇ
- 3 Rāy
- 4 Kānungoi (/*)

1. Properly *San egāra-śao tihattarī aṅke 1173 likhitam*.
2. This word had been originally omitted through oversight and was later written above the line.
3. I. e., *dilām*.
4. This is written above the concluding section of the space covered by the document and has to be read keeping the latter to the left-hand side.
5. *Bhavānidevi* for *Bhavānī Devī* is not quite unjustifiable according to Sanskrit grammar.
6. This is written in slanting lines in the upper right quarter of the sheet to be read from the angle of its upper right corner.
7. This is written in slanting lines in the upper left side of the sheet on a level lower than II and has to be read from an angle opposite to that of the latter.

TRANSLATION

Be it remembered—

[To] Śrīyut Mahārājā Nandakumār Rāyjiw.

This is a loan-deed written in San eleven hundred and seventy-three—1173 in figures. The object (subject-matter) is [narrated] below.

Within my Estate—attached to the village of Munirpur and the village of Raypur and the village of Makarampur (Mukarrampur) and the village of Rāmpurā, under *Taraf* Rāmeśvarpur [in] *Parganā* Dhāwā [in] *Sarkār* Udambar, [in] Mahāl Khālīṣa Sharīfa—in the above-mentioned villages, I am giving [you] the title arising from purchase of rent-free [land in respect of] 251—two hundred and fifty-one—bighās of land fit for earning revenue. Having taken from [your] hand to [my] hand the total price [of the land] amounting to 1,255—twelve hundred fifty-five—Rūpaiyās in coins bearing the regnal year [of the Mughul emperor], I am depositing [the amount] in the Government treasury.

To this effect, the loan-deed is given. [This is] the end. Caitra 11 in the current year.

I

[This is the signature] of Śrī Rāñī Bhavānī Devī.

II

Witness—[This is the signature of] Śrī Lakṣmīnārāyaṇ Rāy, the revenue officer.

III

Witness—[This is the signature of] Śrī Mahendranārāyaṇ Rāy, the revenue officer.

DOCUMENT II

At the top of the sheet we have the *maṅgala*—Śrī Durgā, Durgā being one of the well-known names of the Indian Mother-goddess. The record begins with the same passage as in Document I. Then comes the name of the addressee, viz., Parameśvarī Bewā. The Persian word *bewa* means 'a widow'.

The introductory section of the record following the part discussed above is similar to that of Document I. But, instead of *karaj-patra*, we have here *patra* which means both 'a letter' and 'a deed'. The date, viz. San 1192 corresponding to A.D. 1786-87, is then quoted in the same way as in the other document both in words and figures.

The record proper then begins with a sentence, in which the addressee was allowed to excavate a *jalhari* or tank in *mudāphat* Kalyāṇpur within *Parganā* Pātīkā-bādī and *Taraph* Rāypur. The word *jalhari* is used in the same sense in a passage quoted in J. M. Das's *Bāṅgalabhaṣār Abhidhān* from Kavikaṅkaṇ Mukundarām's *Caṇḍimaṅgal* as follows :

khidki uttar-bhage jalahari tar age
prati bādī kūper sañcay |

The word is possibly derived from Sanskrit *jalādhāra* modified to *jaldhari* through *jaladhara*. *Mudāphat*, from Arabic *muzāfat* (annexed, added or resumed as land; recent or late as a person deceased), is used in the record in the sense of 'attached to', although it is often found in Bengali documents to mean 'the former owner of a property', e.g. *mahāl mudāphat Gopikānta Sarkār*, 'the property or estate formerly in the possession of Gopikānta Sarkār'. *Mudāphat Kalyāṇpur* here really means 'land under the jurisdiction of the revenue-collection station at Kalyāṇpur'. Otherwise *mudāphat* is a mistake for *maujā*.

The next sentence states that, for the said purpose, a plot of fallow land in an area separated from the rental of the Estate (*khārij jamā*, Arabic *khārijī jamā*) and attached to the Zamindār's establishment away from his headquarters (*mapasval-khānā madhye*, from Arabic *mufasṣal* and Persian *khānah*), according to records (*māphik phardda*), lying to the north of the house of Bairāgīdās Bihārā and to the south—touching the boundary—of Tebatṭagrām in Shamskhālī, was allotted to the addressee. The area of the land given was originally written */1 ek bighā* (i.e. 1—one—*bighā*), in which */1* stands corrected to */4*. It appears further that original */1 ek* was corrected */4 cāir*, though *cāir* (i.e. 4). was subsequently rubbed off apparently because the corrections in the word were too obvious to pass as original writing.

The following few sentences mean to say that the addressee should have the tank excavated on the said plot of land, that she should dedicate the water of the tank to God so that it would be available to all people without restriction, that only the embankment on the four sides of the tank would be the addressee's exclusive possession, on which she could plant trees, etc., for enjoying their produce, and that no rent would be demanded on the land by the Zamindār. Thus Parameśvarī had no right to the water of the tank, which was meant for the use of the public of the area. This idea has been expressed in the passage *jal U sāth karaha* (Make the water God's property), in which *U* stands, according to a well-known convention, either for Śrī-Durgā at the top of the sheet or for the word *īśvara*, 'God', and *īśvara-sāth* no doubt stands for Sanskrit *īśvarasāt* (cf. *atmasāt* which is of common use in Bengali). In some cases, the name of the king or donor is mentioned above and it is indicated by the sign in its proper place in the document.

The concluding part of the record is similar to that of Document I. There are only slight changes. The date is given here as the 20th of the Bengali month of Jyaiṣṭha corresponding to May-June, so that it would fall about the beginning of June 1786 A.D. An endorsement refers merely to 'the later part of the current year' (*san sadar ākheri*) probably indicating that the excavation of the tank would have to be completed by that period. The signatory is called Mahārāṇī in this record.

Chittapriya Mitra mentions the circumstances under which the document was issued by Rāṇī Bhavānī, though it is not clear whether he secured all the information from local enquiry or part of it was the result of his inadequate study of the record. He says that the document was found in a house at Murshidabad and that it was given while the Rāṇī was travelling from one part of her Estate to another and was passing through a village inhabited by the Sadgop community. Drinking-water was not easily available at the village and the widow Parameśvarī managed to get some water for quenching the Rāṇī's thirst. Bhavānī became pleased and gave the widow

some land and money for the excavation of a tank and the construction of a temple. There is, however, no mention of any money or temple in the document.

That the record was issued without the Rāṇī's seal and the signatures of the writer and witnesses show that Bhavānī was an extremely unwise administrator, since, as already indicated above, such a document could be quite easily forged. The changes made in the record fraudulently in Parameśvarī's interest at a later date show that the Rāṇī's administration was corrupt or weak. This reminds us of a story told to us by a gentleman of Rajshahi. Some men, while travelling in a boat, were passing by a prosperous village. When the leader of the party learnt on enquiry that the village lay within Rāṇī Bhavānī's Zamindārī, he suggested to his men, *tabe lāgā ek kisti* (Let us then collect an instalment of the villagers' dues to the Zamindar). They then entered the village and represented themselves as sent from Nātor for the collection of revenue. It is said that they did not experience much difficulty in collecting a good sum of money to be shared among themselves. The worthless administration was coupled with the draining of the resources of the Zamindārī by the Rāṇī's liberality and religious activity. She exhibited great zeal in building temples, excavating tanks and giving lands to gods and Brāhmaṇas. There is a saying among the people of Rajshahi that the Brāhmaṇa who does not enjoy any rent-free land granted by Rāṇī Bhavānī is no Brāhmaṇa at all. In view of the fact that documents like hers could be forged without much difficulty, it is not easy to say how many of the records in the possession of the Brāhmaṇas and others were genuine. In any case, there is little doubt that Rāṇī Bhavānī's administration was at least partially responsible for the ultimate ruin of the Zamindārī of Nātor.

TEXT

Śrī-Durgā :⁸

- 1 iyādikirdda (/*)
- 2 Śrī Paramesva(śva)ī beoā
- 3 saccariteṣu⁹ / patram=idam
- 4 san 1192 egāra-śao birānabbai
- 5 aṅke likhanam¹⁰ (/*) kāryaṅ=c=āge (/*) taraph Rāypur
- 6 mudāphat Kalyāṇpur Pargane Paṭikābādī
- 7 mudāphat majkure ekṭī jalahari khanan karibā (/*)
- 8 tad-arthe māphik phardda mapasval-khānā madhye Bairāgī-
- 9 dās(s)Bihārār bāṭīr ottar¹¹ Samaśkhālīr
- 10 Tehaṭṭagrāmer dakṣiṇḍige semānā¹² lāgā
- 11 kbārij jamā patit /4...¹³ bigbā jami
- 12 tomāke dīlāom (/*) jalahari khanan karibā (*)
- 13 jal U sāth karaha (/*) cārī pābād¹⁴ tomār

8. This *maṅgala* is written at the top of the sheet.

9. Correctly *saccaritāsu* which is in Sanskrit.

10. Properly *san egāra śao birānabbai aṅke 1192 likhitam*.

11. Correctly *utar*.

12. Correctly *simānā*.

13. As indicated above, originally /1 ek was written. It was later changed to /4 cārī. But ultimately *cārī* was rubbed off.

14. I.e. *cārī-pād*.

- 14 dakhal (/*) vṛkṣādi(di) lāgaiyā bhog karaha (/*)
 15 rājasva bar-śāl māph (/*) etad-arthe patra dila (/*)
 16 san sadar iti /—20 Jaiṣṭha¹⁵ (//*)

I¹⁶

1. san sadar
2. ākheri (/*)

II¹⁷

1. Śrī Mahārānī(ṇī) Bhavānī-
2. Devyāh//—

TRANSLATION

Śrī-Durgā.

Be it remembered—

To Śrī-Parameśvarī Bewā who is virtuous.

This is a deed written in San eleven hundred and ninety-two—in figures 1192. The object is [narrated] in the sequel.

Taraf Rāypur, Muzāfat Kalyānpur, Pargana Paṭikabādī—in the above-mentioned *Muzāfat*, you should excavate a tank. For that purpose, I am giving you 1—one—*bighā* (later corrected to '4—four—*bighās*') of fallow land which is property detached from the rental of the Estate, lying to the north of the house of Bairāgīdās Bihārā [and] to the south—adjoining the border—of Tehaṭṭagrām which is a part of Shamskhāī.

You should excavate the tank. Dedicate the water [in the name] of God. The four embankments [of the tank] will be in your [exclusive] possession. Plant trees, etc., [on them] and enjoy [their produce]. The revenue is exempted for all years.

To this effect, I am giving [you this] document [during] the current year. [This is] the end. Jyāiṣṭha 20.

I

The concluding part of the current year.

II

[This is the signature] of Śrī Mahārānī Bhavānī Devī.

15. Correctly *Jyāiṣṭha*.

16. This is written in slanting lines at the space to the right of lines 1-5 and has to be read from the angle of the right side of the upper part of the sheet.

17. This is written in the upper right space to be read keeping the writing of the document at the left-hand side.

CHAPTER XVIII

Some Folktales and Folksayings

I

Some of the heroes of Indian legends, who were represented as progenitors of ruling families, were supposed to have been born of the union of a lady with a divine or semi-divine being. In many cases, the father of the hero was a Nāga or mythical serpent.

According to Kalhaṇa's Chronicle of Kashmir entitled *Rāja tarāṅgiṇī*,¹ Durlābhavardhana, who founded the Kārkoṭa dynasty of Kashmir in the seventh century A.D., was the son of the Nāga Kārkoṭa who had enjoyed the king's mother when she was taking her purifying bath. The same story seems to be echoed in the Chaudadanpur inscription² which gives the following account of the origin of the family of Māyideva, the foreign minister of the Kadamba king Kāmadeva.

There was a Brāhmaṇa girl named Niravakarasahā who was enjoyed by the Nāga king of the underworld and gave birth to the progenitor of the Nāga lineage, to which the ancestors of Māyideva, who had been honoured by the Kashmir kings, belonged.

A similar story seeks to explain the Nāgavamśī Rājput origin claimed by the aboriginal Rājās of Chota Nagpur.³ We are told that the king of the Nāgas assumed human form and married a beautiful Brāhmaṇa girl of Vārāṇasī. Unfortunately, the Nāga could not get rid of his forked tongue and foul breath and tried to conceal these disagreeable peculiarities from his wife by always sleeping with his back to her. But, as is usual with the wives, the lady soon discovered her husband's secret and, naturally, became curious to get an explanation. The Nāga, however, could disclose his identity only at the cost of separation from his wife. Soon the couple set out on a pilgrimage to Purī in Orissa. When they reached near about Ranchi, the wife was seized with the pains of child-birth. She now asked for the explanation and, since questions asked on such an occasion must be answered, the husband was compelled to explain that he was really the Nāga king in disguise. He then turned into a gigantic Cobra, while his wife gave birth to a son and died. When the child grew up to manhood, he became the king of the area and thus founded the dynasty of the Nāgavamśī Rājās of Chota Nagpur.

1. III. 490, 529-30.

2. *Journal of the Karnatak University*, Vol. III, No. 2, January, 1959, p. 47.

3. See Risley, *People of India*, 1915, p. 73; Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, 1872, pp. 165-66; Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kiskindha*, p. 9.

The above story reminds us of the Tunic legend of Lohengrin, the mythical Knight of the Swan and of the Holy Grail. He is said to have been carried in a boat drawn by a swan to Antwerp where he became the husband of the princess of Brabant on the condition that she should never ask his name. But the lady was curious enough to break the agreement, and the swan came with the boat and carried Lohengrin away.⁴

The Jain *Prabandhakośa* gives the following story⁵ about the origin of the great Śātavāhana family of the Deccan, which flourished from the first century B.C. to the third century A.D.

At the city of Pratiṣṭhāna (modern Paithan on the Godāvarī in the Aurangabad District, Maharashtra), there lived two Brāhmaṇa brothers together with their widowed sister. One day the girl went to the Godāvarī for her bath when the Nāga King Śeṣa was struck by her beauty and enjoyed her. At the time of leaving the lady, Śeṣa told her that she would bear from him a son who would be a great monarch. In course of time, a son was actually born to the Brāhmaṇa widow, and he became famous under the name Śātavāhana. The story then goes on to say how Śātavāhana later defeated king Vikramāditya, another hero of Indian folklore, and became the king of Pratiṣṭhāna.

Although the Nāga association seems to be popular with the authors of Indian folktales, there are similar other stories in which the Nāga is substituted by some other divinity. Thus the mythical progenitor of the Candella dynasty is represented in a story of the same type as born of the daughter of a Brāhmaṇa of Vārāṇasī, who had been enjoyed by the Moon-god when she was taking her bath in the waters of the Rārī Tālāb of the place.⁶

There may be similar other stories known in India and elsewhere.

We have some stories in Indian records, both literary and epigraphic, in which a king is represented as suffering a defeat and losing his life and his widowed queen, pregnant at the time of her husband's death, as receiving the protection of a holy personage and giving birth to a posthumous son who is said to have re-established the fortunes of the family. This is a folklore motif, and in no case has a legend of this type any historical basis.

A well-known story found in the *Harivaṃśa* (I. 13-14) and a number of the Purāṇas says how the death of the Ikṣvāku king Bāhu was avenged by his posthumous son Sagara.⁷ We are told that Bāhu was defeated and driven out of his kingdom by the Haihayas and Tālajāṅghas who were allied with the Śakas, Yavanas, Kambojas, Pāradas and Pahlavas. Bāhu fled to the forest together with his queen who was pregnant at the time. There the king died, and the sage Aurva of the Bhṛgu family gave shelter to the queen who soon gave birth to Sagara. The prince received his training from Aurva and mastered the use of the fire weapon. When Sagara grew up to manhood, he succeeded in destroying all the enemies of his father and in re-establishing himself on his paternal throne.

4. Cf. Riseley, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

5. See *Vikrama Volume*, ed. R.K. Mookerji, pp. 663-64.

6. Cf. H.C. Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. II, p. 665.

7. See Sircar, *Studies in the Society and Administrations of Ancient and Medieval India*, Vol. I, pp. 41 ff.

The same literary motif is noticed in the legend of Mādhavarman found in the Telugu works on the history of Anumakoṇḍa (Warangal District, Andhra Pradesh). It is said that the king Somadeva of Kandhāra was defeated and killed by the king of Kāṭaka and that Śiriyādevī, the pregnant queen of Somadeva, took refuge at the house of the Brāhmaṇa Mādhavaśarma of Anumakoṇḍa. The widowed queen is said to have given birth there to a son who was called Mādhavarman after his mother's protector. Later, prince Mādhavarman defeated and killed the king of Kāṭaka and became the ruler of the Anumakoṇḍa region.⁸

According to the inscriptions⁹ of the Cālukyas of Veṅgī, a king of the Ikṣvāku house of Ayodhyā, by name Vijayāditya, came to Dakṣiṇāpatha and lost his life in an encounter with the Pallava king Trilocana. His queen, who was pregnant at the time, escaped to the abode of the Brāhmaṇa Viṣṇubhaṭṭa Somayājīn at the village of Muḍivemu where she gave birth to a posthumous son named Viṣṇuvardhana. This prince subdued all the rulers of the South, married the Pallava king's daughter and succeeded in establishing his suzerainty over the whole land.

We have a similar story in the bardic Chronicles of Mewar.¹⁰ King Vijayasena or Vijayāditya of Ayodhyā is said to have founded the city of Valabhī (modern Vala near Bhavanagar, Gujarat State). His descendant Śīlāditya was killed by the barbarians who sacked Valabhī. The widowed queen Puṣpavatī, who was pregnant, took shelter in a cave where she received help from a Brāhmaṇa lady named Kamalāvatī and gave birth to Guhila or Guhadatta. Puṣpavatī burnt herself to death, and Guhila (Guhadatta) was brought up by Kamalāvatī. When this posthumous son of king Śīlāditya grew to manhood, he succeeded in establishing his authority over Mewar.

There may be similar other stories in Indian literature and folklore as well as the folk literature of other parts of the world.

We have eleven specimens of the tale of 'the milk-pouring cow' in different parts of India, viz. eight from Assam, one among the Kotas of the Nilgiris in Tamilnadu and one each from the Kedār-Badī area in the Himalayas and from Orissa.¹¹ The motif is recognised in Stith Thomson's *Motif Index of Folk Literature* (latest ed) as No. B 115. 2. 2 - 'Location of settlement or place where a cow stops and where milk flows by itself'.

There appear to be such stories prevalent in other parts of India; but one would readily come to the mind of all students of Rajput tales and history. It is the well-known legend of Bappa Rāval who was the progenitor of the Nagda-Ahar branch of the Guhilaputras of Mewar. The story is given in James Tod's monumental work entitled *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* and various other treatises on the history of the Rānās of Mewar.¹²

According to the legends of Mewar, the Bhils of Idar made Guhila, the posthumous son of the last king of Valabhī, their king. But, during the reign of Nāgāditya,

8. See B.V. Krishna, Rao, *Early Dynasties of Andhradeśa*, pp. 436 ff.

9. Cf. the Chellur plates of Viṛaḥḍa in *SI*, Vol. I, pp. 49 ff.; Sircar, *The Guhilas of Kīṣkindhā*, p. 14.

10. See Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

11. See *Folklore*, Vol. V, No. 2; Vol. VI, Nos. 1 and 5.

12. Cf. Tod., *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 247 ff.

the eighth descendant of Guhila, the Bhils rose in rebellion and killed the king. Prince Bappa, the son Nāgāditya, was then only three years of age. The Brāhmaṇas of Bīrnagar, who served as priests of Guhila's house, took Bappa under their protection and removed him to the hilly regions of Nagindra (modern Nagda near Udaipur). Here Bappa soon took to the profession of tending cows.

While Bappa pastured cows in the Valley of Nagindra, he was once suspected by his master of appropriating the milk of a favourite cow to his own use. The honest prince was justly indignant; but he had to admit that there was reason for the suspicion since the cow was found to be dry when she entered the pens in the evening.

Next day Bappa watched the cow and traced her to a narrow dell 'when he beheld the udder spontaneously pouring its stores amidst the shrubs'. Under a thicket of cane, the hermit Hārītarāśī was reposing in a state of abstraction and a Śiva-līṅga nearby was receiving the shower of milk from the cow. People witnessed the sight, and Bappa's honour was vindicated.

Bappa now became a disciple of Hārītarāśī; and through the favours of the sage as well as of the goddess Ambikā, the consort of Śiva, the cowherd prince soon became the lord of the land as well as the Dewān (Regent) of the god Ekaliṅga, i.e., the Śiva-līṅga worshipped by the sage Hārītarāśī. On the spot where the god was receiving the milk-bath from the cow's udder, Bappa now built the celebrated temple of Ekaliṅga, one of the most important pilgrim-spots in Rajasthan even today.

There has been an interesting controversy on 'beef-eating in the Hindu folklore of Bengal', in the *Folklore*, Vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 13-19; No. 4, pp. 174-177. There is no doubt that, in this controversy, truth lies on the side of the view that beef-eating was not unknown in the Hindu society, but the reference, in this context, to the learned article of Rajendralal Mitra regarding the prevalence of beef-eating in ancient India, which was published long ago in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* does not appear to be enough because Mitra does not speak of the late medieval period to which the folktales in question should probably be referred. There is better proof of the prevalence of beef-eating in the mediaeval age, among the Bengali Hindus, including Brāhmaṇas, in the *Smṛti-nibandhas* composed by Bengali Brāhmaṇas, e.g., in Śulapāṇi's *Prāyaścittaviveka* (c. 1400 A.D.) As late as the middle of the nineteenth century, the Bengali Brāhmaṇa compiler of the supplement to the celebrated *Śabdakalpadrūma* quoted Śulapāṇi as prescribing *Prāyaścitta* or expiation for the sin of the three categories of Hindu beef-eaters.

A mild *Prāyaścitta* is prescribed for those Hindus who take beef unintentionally (*ajñānataḥ*) for only once (*sakṛt*), while the prescription for people taking beef intentionally (*jñānataḥ*) and as a matter habit (*abhyāsa*) is stringent. But the severest punishment is prescribed for those who eat beef habitually for a long time (*cira-kāl-abhyāsa*). The punishment of this third category of beef-eating Hindus includes a second *Upanayana* (the ceremony of sacred thread), and this fact clearly refers to Brāhmaṇa culprits, because the Hindu population of Bengal was usually divided by the medieval writers only between the Brāhmaṇa and the Śūdra who had no *Upanayana*.¹³ The above prescriptions show that even babitual beef-eating for a period covering several

13. Cf. Sircar, *Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India*, Vol. I. p. 115 and notes

years was not unknown among the Hindus of medieval Bengal. It is impossible to believe that reference could have been made to imaginary offences.

Earlier authorities like Devala, some of whose verses have been quoted by Śulapāṇi, speak of the purification of Hindus of different communities, who were compelled to take forbidden food, etc., during their stay or captivity in the land of the Mlecchas for a number of years.¹⁴ But conditions were different when Śulapāṇi wrote, because practically the whole country was then under the Mlecchas. In any case, it is difficult to believe that a person, used to a particular food for several years, would be successful in saving himself from the temptation of taking it at least on occasions even after his purification.

It is therefore clear that beef-eating was prevalent in medieval Bengal among a section of the Hindus, not excluding the Brāhmaṇas, even though it was not a popular habit. This fact is reflected in some of the Bengali folktales.

II

A large number of pithy sayings in Bengali verse are attributed to Ḍāk (or Ḍāk-puruṣ) and Khanā. They look like proverbs primarily meant for agriculturist householders, although many of them are of general interest. The aphorisms usually relate to astrology and meteorology.

Collections of Khanā's sayings, which are more popular in Bengal than Ḍāk's, have often been published, and there are many editions in the market; e.g., *Khanār Vacan* compiled by K.C. Gupta, General Library, Calcutta, and by P. Chattopadhyaya, Orient Library, Calcutta. The aphorisms of Ḍāk in Bengali have also been collected and published by several persons. Most of the sayings attributed to Ḍāk and Khanā have been quoted by S.K. De in his *Bāṅglā Pravāḍ* (Bengali Proverbs) which contains an exhaustive bibliography. For a discussion on these aphorisms, one may consult D.C. Sen's *Vaṅgabhāṣā O Sahitya* (Bengali Language and Literature), N.N. Vasu's *Bengali Viśvakoṣa* (Encyclopaedia), A. Bhattacharya's *Bāṅglā Lok-sahitya* (Bengali Folk-Literature), etc.

Similar sayings are popular in Assam and Mithilā (North Bihar), where, however, they are attributed to Ḍāk alone, there being no place for Khanā in the local traditions. A collection of Ḍāk's sayings in Assamese has been recently published by D. Datta who has appended to his work a good bibliography on the subject. The topic has also been discussed in works like Maheswar Neog's *Asamiyā Sahityar Rūprekhā* (Outline of Assamese Literature), etc. A large number of Ḍāk's sayings in Maithilī have been quoted by J. Christian in this *Behar Proverbs*, published in 1891. Ḍāk is called Ghāgh in U.P. and often also in Bihar. A collection of his sayings is found in Shibkumar Tripathi's *Mahākavi Ghāgh*, printed at the Sulabh Press, Muzaffarpur, 1945.

It will be seen that, out of the three territories of Eastern India, the aphorisms are divided between Ḍāk and Khanā only in Bengal. Many of the Bengali sayings of Khanā are, however, in their Assamese and Maithilī forms, attributed to Ḍāk in Assam and to Ḍāk or Ghāgh in North Bihar. Even in Bengal, Durgagari Mukhopadhyay attributed the majority of Khanā's aphorisms to Ḍāk in his *Ḍāk Puruṣer*

14. The extent *Devalaṁṛti* in 90 verses dealing with purification and *Prāyaścittas* for contact with Mlecchas is regarded by Kāra as a late compilation (*Hist. Dharm.*, Vol. I, p. 121).

Kathā (The Sayings of Ḍāk Puruṣ) published in 1904. In S.K De's *Bāṅglā Pravāḍ* also, two of the popular proverbs (Nos. 6122 and 7981) are represented as attributed to both Ḍāk and Khanā. These facts probably suggest that, in Bengal also, the sayings were originally assigned to a single astrologer, but that they were divided between two of them only after the development of distinct legends regarding the latter. In different parts of Northern India, as we shall see below, the aphorisms are represented as the sayings of a single astrologer or as the address of one astrologer to another. Amongst a number of Khanā's sayings, while some are attributed to Varāhna or Mihira, some others are represented as the sayings of Rāvaṇa. Of course, as is the case with the sayings in the other languages, most of the aphorisms have no reference to their author.

There has been some discussion on the meaning of *Khanā* and *Ḍāk*, although the representation of the persons so named in Bengali tradition respectively as a female and male astrologer has shadowed the real meanings of the words. In our opinion, *Khanā* is derived from Sanskrit *Kṣaṇada*=Prakrit *Khaṇaa*, meaning 'an astrologer', while *Ḍāk* may be taken to mean 'a proclamation' (from its common meaning 'a shout, cry or call') and *Ḍākpuruṣ*, 'an announcer of proclamations'. As we shall see below, there is reason to believe that Ḍāk and Khanā could not have been personal names. As regards Ḍāk, A. Bhattacharya thinks that it was a name applied to a class of Tantric Buddhist teachers. It is, however, difficult to accept the suggestion, since, as we shall see later, Ḍāk's sayings are popular even in areas where Tantric Buddhist influence was never very strong.

Similar aphorisms are current in Uttar Pradesh where they are attributed, as we have seen, not to Ḍāk but to Ghāgh. In reality, however, the Hindī word *Ghāgh* means 'a clever, old or wise man'. There has been some discussion on Ghāgh's sayings, a recent publication being an article in the *Statesman*, Calcutta, dated the 20th August, 1964. Some of these aphorisms refer to Bhaddarī or Bhadrī (sometimes mentioned as Ghāghin), and these have close relation to Ḍāk's sayings as prevalent in Rajasthan. The Rājasthānī legends regarding Ḍāk and his wife, again, throw welcome light on the Bengal tradition about Khanā.

According to Bengali folklore, the female astrologer Khanā was the wife of Mihira who was the son of Varāha, the astronomer at the court of king Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī. All this is imaginary, 'King Vikrama' of Indian tradition being unknown to genuine history. Of course, the celebrated astronomer Varāhamihira flourished in the Ujjayinī region in West Malwa during the sixth century A.D., and it is his name that has been at the root of the imaginary 'Mihira, son of Varāha'. We shall see below that such fabrications are also known from other parts of India. It has to be noted that nothing can be more absurd than the conception of the daughter-in-law of a sixth century astronomer of Malwa composing aphorisms in the Bengali language. The historical value of the legends about Ḍāk is no better.

There are divergent traditions about Ḍāk in Eastern India. In Bengal and North Bihar, Ḍāk is said to have belonged to the milkman community while, in Assam, he is supposed to have been a potter of Lohī Daṅgarā, the modern village of Lauhagaon about seven miles to the south of Barpeta in the Kamrup District. It is said that the potter girl, who was barren, received a boon from Mihira, an astronomer of Ujjayinī, and gave birth to Ḍāk. But one of the Assamese aphorisms represents

Ḍāk as a member of the Brāhmaṇa community. Such disparity no doubt goes against the genuineness of the legends. Moreover, if Ḍāk was a historical personage, then his sayings must have been composed in a single regional language of India. But, as we shall see below, Ḍāk's sayings are popular even in Rajasthan in Western India far away from the said three territories of Eastern India.

A large number of Ḍāk's sayings in Rajasthan have been quoted by Jagdish Singh Gahlot in his *Rājasthānī Kṛṣikahāvateṃ* (Jodhpur, 1941). Just as this Rājasthānī Ḍāk is unknown to the writers of East India, Gahlot was unaware of the existence of Ḍāk's sayings in Eastern India. It may be mentioned here that Rajasthan's Ḍāk can scarcely be regarded as a Tāntric Buddhist teacher, since Tāntric Buddhism does not appear to have ever been popular in that area.

Some of the Rājasthānī aphorisms published by Gahlot are represented as addressed to Bhaḍḷī or Bhaḍḍalī by Ḍaṅk. There is no doubt that this Ḍaṅk is the same as Ḍāk of East India. It is well-known that Hindī and the allied languages generally represent Ḍakini as Ḍaṅkinī. Moreover, the astrologers of the Ḍākot community of Rajasthan claim to be the descendants of Ḍaṅk, though Ḍākot really stands for Ḍākaputra as Gahlot for Guhilaputra. Of course, it is difficult to say whether the name Ḍaṅk has anything to do with *ḍaṅka* (a drum). But we know that proclamations were made in ancient and medieval India by the beat of drums.

According to the Rājasthānī tradition, Ḍaṅk (Ḍāk) was a Brāhmaṇa who flourished in the age of king Parikṣit of the *Mahābhārata*. He was a sound mathematician and astrologer and was the husband of Sāvitrī, daughter of the great physician Dhanvantari. Another name of this Sāvitrī was Bhaḍḷī or Bhaḍḍalī who was herself a great astrologer. It is further said that Ḍaṅk (Ḍāk) was the son of Varāhamihira, the court astronomer of king Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī. Of course, the contemporaneity of Parikṣit, Dhanvantari and Varāhamihira is as absurd as the Bengal legend ascribing Bengali aphorisms to the pen of Varāha's daughter-in-law. But what is of considerable importance is the fact that the female astrologer who is supposed to have been the daughter-in-law of the great astronomer of West Malwa is called Khanā in Bengal and Bhaḍḷī or Bhaḍḍalī in Rajasthan. We have seen above that *Khanā* really means 'an astrologer'. There is reason to believe that Bhaḍḷī or Bhaḍḍalī also means the same thing. Bhaḍḷī (Bhaḍḍalī) is the name of the astrologer community of Rajasthan, also called Ḍākot, Gurde, Thavariyā, Sanicariyā, Disantari and Joṣī (Jyotiṣī). The name of the same community is found in Uttar Pradesh as *Bhaḍariyā* 'i.e., *Bhaḍurī* or *Bhaḍḍarī* (*Bhaḍrī*), the forms being often used to indicate a female of the astrologer community. Thus the essentially masculine words *Khanā* and *Bhaḍḷī*, etc., meaning 'an astrologer', were popularly conceived as the names of a female astrologer married to Varāha's son called Mihira in Bengal and Ḍaṅk (Ḍāk) in Rajasthan, who is the same as Ghāgh of Uttar Pradesh.

We are quoting below the aphorisms mentioning Ḍaṅk (Ḍāk) and Bhaḍḷī (Bhaḍḍalī) from Gahlot's work.

1. *Parbhāte geh ḍambrā sāmje silā bāv |*

Ḍaṅk kahai he Bhaḍḍalī kalā taṇa subhāv ||

Ḍaṅk says to Bhaḍḍalī, 'Clouds flying in the morning and cold winds blowing in the evening are sure signs of famine.'

2. *Ugantero mächlo āthamvtero mokh |*

Ḍaṅk kahai he Bhaḍlī nadiyam chadhsi gokh ||

Ḍaṅk says, 'O Bhaḍlī, rainbow at sunrise and red rays of the setting sun augur the overflowing of rivers.'

3. *Sāvaṇ pahilī pemcamī jhīṇī chāmṭ padai |*

Ḍaṅk kahai he Bhaḍlī saphlām runkḥ phalai ||

Ḍaṅk says to Bhaḍlī, 'If there are showers of rain on the fifth day of the dark half of the month of Sāvaṇ, the fruit-bearing trees will produce excessively.'

4. *Poh sabimal pekhje Cait nirmal camd |*

Ḍaṅk kahe he Bhaḍlī maṇ hūtām an maṇd ||

Ḍaṅk says, 'If the sky is thickly clouded during the whole month of Poṣ, but is cloudless in the bright half of Cait, O Bhaḍlī, grains will sell cheaper than a maund per Rupee.'

5. *Bhādarve jag relsī chaṭ anurādhā hoy ||*

Ḍaṅk kahai he Bhaḍlī karo na cintā koy ||

Ḍaṅk says to Bhaḍlī, 'If it rains all over the country in the month of Bhādom and if there be Anurādhā nakṣatra on the sixth day of that month, do not be anxious for the future of crops.'

6. *Citrā dipak Cetve Svāte Govardhan |*

Ḍaṅk kahe he Bhaḍlī athag nīpje ann ||

Ḍaṅk says, 'O Bhaḍlī, if the Dīvālī festival falls in the Citrā nakṣatra and there be Svātī nakṣatra when Govardhan is worshipped in the following morning, there will be abundance of crops.'

7. *Dīvā bitī paṁcamī Som Śukar Gurū Mūl |*

Ḍaṅk kahe he Bhaḍlī nīpje sātūm tūl ||

Ḍaṅk says to Bhaḍlī, 'If on the fifth day of the bright half of the month of Kātik, after the Dīvālī, the Mūl nakṣatra falls on Monday. Friday or Thursday, the crops will be plentiful.'

8. *Sukar-vārri bādri rahī Sanīsar chāy |*

Ḍaṅk kahe he Bhaḍlī barsyā binā na jāy ||

Ḍaṅk says, 'O Bhaḍlī, if clouds appear in the sky on Friday and remain there till Saturday, it will not disappear without raining.'

9. *Māh Maṅgal Jeṭh Ravī Bhādarvai San hoy |*

Ḍaṅk kahe he Bhaḍlī birlā jīvai koy ||

Ḍaṅk says to Bhaḍlī, 'If there be five Tuesdays in the month of Māgh, or five Sundays in the month of Jeṭh, or five Saturdays in the month of Bhādom, then, so severe will the famine be that few people will survive.'

10. *Somām Sukrām Surgurām je camdo ūgaṁt ||*

Ḍaṅk kahai he Bhaḍlī jal thal ek karānt ||

Ḍaṅk says, 'O Bhaḍlī, if the new moon in the month of Āṣāḍh falls on Monday, Friday or Thursday, there will be heavy showers of rain.'

If one assiduously collects all the aphorisms in the regional languages, attributed to Ḍāk (Ḍaṅk), Ghāgh, Khanā, etc., and attempts a comparative study of the entire material, it will indeed be a very valuable contribution to the agricultural wisdom and folk literature of India.

PUBLISHED WORKS OF DR. D. C. SIRCAR

(12.4.1973)

N.B.—Books in Bengali and some other writings have been omitted from this list.

I. BOOKS INCLUDING PERIODICAL AND VOLUMES EDITED

A—Books

1. *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan*, Calcutta University Press, 1935.
2. *The Early Pallavas*, Motilal Banarsidass, Lahore, 1935.
3. *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan*, Calcutta University, 1939.
4. *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, Vol. I, Calcutta University, 1942 and 1965.
5. *A Grammar of the Prakrit Language*, Calcutta University, 1943, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1970.
6. *The Śākta Pūthas*, Calcutta, 1948, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1973.
7. *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, Government of India, New Delhi, 1957 and 1967.
8. *Maski Inscription of Aśoka*, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, 1958.
9. *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1960 and 1971.
10. *Indian Epigraphy*, Motilal Banarsidass, 1965.
11. *The Guhilas of Kishkindhā*, Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 1965.
12. *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1966.
13. *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, Indian Studies Past & Present, Calcutta, 1967.
14. *Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India*, Vol. I—Society, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1967.
15. *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi, 1969.
16. *Studies in Indian Coins*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1968.
17. *Landlordism and Tenancy in Ancient and Medieval India*, Lucknow University, 1969.
18. *Some Problems of Kushāna and Rājput History*, N. Dey, Calcutta, 1969.
19. *Introduction to Indian Epigraphy and Palaeography*, N. Dey, Calcutta, 1971.
20. *Problems concerning the Kushānas*, Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar, 1971.
21. *Studies in the Religious Life of Ancient and Medieval India*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1971.
22. *Mahāmāyūrī*, N. Dey, Calcutta, 1972.
23. *Epigraphical Discoveries in East Pakistan*, Sanskrit College, Calcutta (in the press).
24. *Foreigners in the Ancient Punjab: The Iranians and Greeks*, Punjabi University, Patiala (in the press).
25. *Studies in the Political and Administrative Systems in Ancient and Medieval India*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi (in the press).
26. *Studies in the Yūgapurāṇa and other Texts*, Oriental Publishers, Delhi-6.
27. *Studies in the Medieval Inscriptions of Eastern India*, Oriental Publishers, Delhi-6 (in the press).

B—Periodicals and Volumes edited

1. *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1951-52, 1952-53, 1953-54, 1955-56, 1957-58, 1958-59 and 1959-60.
2. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vols. XXX (1953-1954-excluding Parts I-II), XXXI (1955-1956), XXXII (1957-1958-excluding Parts II to IV and the first half of Part VII), XXXIII (1959-1960), XXXIV (1961-1962), XXXV (1963-1964-excluding Part VIII) and a few Parts of Vols. XXVIII (1949-1950 Part VIII), XXIX (1951-1952-Part VIII) and XXXVI (1965-1966-Part I-III).
3. *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, Vols. I (1967-68), II (1968-69), III (1969-70), IV (1970-71) and V (1971-72).
4. *Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India*, Calcutta University, 1966.

5. *The Śakti Cult and Tārā*, Calcutta University, 1967.
6. *Foreign Elements in Hindn Population* by D. R. Bhandarkar, N. Dey, Calcutta, 1968.
7. *The Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies*, Calcutta University, 1969.
8. *Prāchyavidyā-taraṅgiṇī*, Calcutta University, 1969.
9. *The status of Woman* by E. W. Hopkins N. Dey Calcutta, 1969.
10. *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography*, Calcutta University, 1970.
11. *Origin of the Buddha Image* by A. K. Comaraswamy, N. Dey, Calcutta, 1970.
12. *Foreigners in Ancient India and Lakṣmī and Śarasvatī in Art and Literature*, Calcutta University, 1970.
13. *Indian Inscriptions and the Antiquity of Indian Artificial Poetry* by G. Bühler, N. Dey, Calcutta, 1970.
14. *Early Indian Indigenous Coins*, Calcutta University, 1971.
15. *Social Life in Ancient India*, Calcutta University, 1971.
16. *Religious Life in Ancient India*, Calcutta University, 1972.
17. *Ancient Indian Numismatics* by D. R. Bhandarkar, Part I (1971) and Part II (1972), N. Dey, Calcutta.
18. *Early Indian Political and Administrative Systems*, Calcutta University, 1972.
19. *Trade and Industry in Ancient India*, Calcutta University, 1972.
20. *Early History and Culture of the Jains*, Calcutta University, 1973.

II. INSCRIPTIONS

1. An Inscription dated in the reign of Emperor Muhammad Shāh from Udaypur, *Indian Hist. Quart.*, Vol. VII, June 1931, pp. 410ff.
2. An Inscription of Aśoka discovered at Yerragudi, *ibid.*, December 1931, pp. 737ff.
3. Three Līṅgarāja Temple Inscriptions (1. Inscription of Gaṅga Narasiṃha I, Saka 1165; 2. of Vīravarakesarī, year 4; 3. of Gaṅga Narasiṃha II, Aṅka year 24), *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. III, July 1936, pp. 121-26.
4. Two Līṅgarāja Temple Inscriptions of the time of Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III, *ibid.*, Vol. VI 1939, pp. 71-76.
5. A Votive Inscription from the Stūpa at Ghaṇṭaśāla, *ibid.*, December 1939, p. 346.
6. Pāikpārā Vāsudeva Image Inscription of King Govindacandra of Bengal, Year 23, *ibid.*, Vol. VII, April 1941, pp. 405-16.
7. A Sanskrit-Maithilī Document of the time of Muhammad Shāh, A.D. 1730, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Rec. Com.*, Vol. XVIII, 1942, pp. 87-91.
8. Vatsagulma Copper-plate grant of King Vinḍhyasakti II, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVII, March 1941, pp. 110-16.
9. Goa Copper-plate Inscription of King Chandravarman, *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, Vol. XXIII (Silver Jubilee Volume), 1942, pp. 510-14.
10. Kalāikuri Copper-plate Inscription of Gupta Year 120, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XIX, March 1943, pp. 12-26.
11. Pīparḍulā Copper-plate Inscription of King Narendra of Śarabhapura, *ibid.*, June 1943, pp. 139-46 (with L.P. Pandeya).
12. Nārāyaṇpur Vināyaka Image Inscription of King Mahīpāla of Bengal, Year 4, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IX, No. 1, 1942, pp. 121-25.
13. Nālandā Seals, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XIX, 1943, pp. 272-81.
14. Kālībhanā Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Somavarṁśī King Mahābbhavad Gupta I Janamejaya, *Ind. Hist. Quart.* Vol. XX, September 1944, pp. 237-50 (with P.C. Rath).
15. Kailāṇ Copper-plate Inscription of King Śrīdharaṇa Rāta of Samatāṭa, *ibid.*, Vol. XXIII, September 1947, pp. 221-41.
16. Pāikpārār Vāsudeva-mūrtite Govindachandrer Lekh, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Jyāiṣṭha B.S. 1348, pp. 768-75.
17. 120 Guptaḍder Aprakāśita Kalāikuri Tāmraśāsan, *Daṅgaśrī* (Bengali), Vaiśākh, B.S. 1350, pp. 415-21.
18. Śūravarṁśiya Harirājer Vārāṇasī Tāmraśāsan, *Bhāratavarsha*, Āshāḍh, B.S. 1351, pp. 45-47.
19. Bāṅgālār Itihāser Navāviskṛita Upādān (1. Two Midnapur Grants of the time of King Śaśāṅka 2 Nārāyaṇpur Image Inscription of the time of King Mahīpāla), *Pravāsi* (Bengali), Śrāvaṇ, B.S. 1350, pp. 291-300.

20. Pāṭnā Jilār Masjid-gātre Pāṅg'ā Śilālipi, *Paṅg'ā Sahitya Parishat Patrikā* (Bengali), Vol. LI, B.S. 1351, pp 80-82.
21. Two Stone Inscriptions (1. Brāhmī Inscription from Barhut, 2. A Stone Inscription from the Pāṭnā District), *Jour. R. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XIV, 1948, pp. 113-16.
22. A Stone Inscription in the Pāṭnā Museum, *ibid.*, pp. 117-30.
23. Two Pillar Inscriptions (1. Banāras Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta, year 159, 2. Nālandā Stone Pillar Inscription of the time of Rājyapāla, Year 24), *ibid.*, Vol. XV, 1949, pp. 5-8.
24. Two Tortoise- shell Inscriptions in the Dacca Museum, *ibid.*, pp. 101-08.
25. Purī Copper-plate Inscription of Gaṅga Bhānu II, *ibid.*, Vol. XVII, 1951, pp. 19-26.
26. First Set of the Kendupāṭnā Plates of Gaṅga Narasiṃha II, Śaka 1217 and Aṅka 21, *ibid.*, pp. 33-39.
27. Two Plates of Devānandadeva, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 325-34.
28. Barli Fragmentary Stone Inscription, *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XXXVII, 1951, pp. 34-38.
29. Nanduru Earthen Pot Inscription, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XIX, 1945, pp. 203-07.
30. Copper-plate Inscription of King Vijayamāṇikya of Tripurā, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XVII, 1951, pp. 73-82.
31. Copper-plate Inscription of King Bhavadeva of Devaparvata, *ibid.*, pp. 83-94.
32. Some Inscriptions from Bihār, *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XXXVII, 1952, Parts 3-4, pp. 1-13.
33. Chicacole Plates of Gaṅga Devendravarman, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XXVIII, 1952, pp. 17-20.
34. Chicacole Plates of Gaṅga Anantavarman, *ibid.*, pp. 47-51.
35. Kesaribeḍā Plates of Nala Arthapati-bhaṭṭāraka, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 12-17.
36. Cheedivalasa Plates of Gaṅga Devendravarman, Gaṅga Year 397, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XVIII, 1952, pp. 77-81.
37. Une Inscription sur Piere de V.S. 1553 du District de Pāṭnā, *Journale Asiatique*, 1950, pp. 97-101.
38. Inscription of King Hariṛāja of Bundelkhand, *Journ. Or. Res.*, Vol. XVIII, 1948-49, pp. 51-57.
39. Mandhuk Inscription (Pāla Rule in the Tippera District), *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, March 1952, pp. 51-57.
40. Madras Museum Plates of Narendradhavalā, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 40-50.
41. Polsarā Plates of Arkeśvaradeva, Yugaṇḍa 4248, *ibid.*, pp. 63-67.
42. Sumaṇḍala Plates of Prithivīvīgraha-bhaṭṭāraka, Gupta year 250, *ibid.*, pp. 79-85.
43. Hindol Plates of Kulasthamba, *ibid.*, pp. 107-14 (with P. Acharya).
44. Three Inscriptions from Valgudar, *ibid.*, pp. 137-45.
45. Two Inscriptions from Jājpur, *ibid.*, pp. 179-85.
46. Guñjī Rock Inscription, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XIX, 1953, pp. 59-61.
47. Kendupāṭnā Plates of Narasiṃha II, Sets II and III, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 185-95.
48. Terundia Plate of Śubhākra II, *ibid.*, pp. 211-16.
49. Four Baikshukī Inscriptions, *ibid.*, pp. 220-26.
50. Nagarī Plates of Anaṅgabhīma III, Śaka 1151 and 1152, *ibid.*, pp. 235-58.
51. Russellkonda Plates of Neṭṭabhañja, *ibid.*, pp. 258-63.
52. Two Grants of the Bhañja King of Vañjulvaka (1. Plates of Śilābhañja Tribhuvanakalasa, 2. of Neṭṭabhañja Tribhuvanakalasa), *ibid.*, pp. 272-83 (with P. Acharya).
53. Mahāḍā Plates of Someśvaradevavarman, Year 23, *ibid.*, pp. 283-93 (with M. Venkataramayya).
54. Purī Plates of Gaṅga Narasiṃha IV, *ibid.*, pp. 302-12.
55. Two Inscriptions from Kelgān (1. Plates of Someśvaradeva, 2. Stray Plate) *ibid.*, pp. 321-28.
56. Two Plates from Kanūs (1. Plate of Lokavīgraha, year 280, 2. of Bhānudatta, year 5), *ibid.*, pp. 328-34.
57. Two Brāhmī Inscriptions (1. Inscription from the Vicinity of Kosam, 2. Mathurā Inscription of the time of Śoḍāsa), *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XXXIX, Parts 1-2, 1953, pp. 41-48.
58. A Brāhmī Inscription from Mathurā, *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. XIV, 1953, pp. 6-9.
59. Nālandā Inscription of Śūrapāla, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIX, 1953, pp. 301-302.
60. Bolangīr Museum Plates of Mahāśivagupta I Yayāti, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XIX, No. 2, 1953 pp. 117-24.
61. Two Pāla Plates from Belwa, (1. Plate of Mahīpāla I, Regnal year 5, 2. of Vīgrahapāla III, Regnal year 11), *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 1-13.

IV

62. Two Śailodbhava Grants from Bānpur (1. Grant of Madhyamarāja, 2. of Dharmarāja), *ibid.*, pp. 32-43.
63. Alagum Inscription of Anantavarman, Rengal Year 62, *ibid.*, pp. 44-48 (with S. Ratha Sarma).
64. Bangaon Plate of Vīgrahapāla III, Regnal Year 17, *ibid.*, pp. 48-57.
65. Two Jain Inscriptions in the Lucknow Museum (1. Darbat Image Inscription of the time of Chandella Kīrtivarman, V.S. 1132, 2. Unao Image Inscription of the time of Gāhadavāla Govindachandra, V.S. 1210), *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXX, No. 2, June 1954, pp. 183-88.
66. Sāntirigrāma Grant of Daṇḍimahādevī, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 79ff.
67. Some Unpublished Inscriptions, *Journ., Bih. Soc.*, Vol. XL, Part 2, June 1954, pp. 91-98.
68. Siddheswar Inscription of Narasiṃha IV, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 105-08 (with K.B. Tripathi).
69. Bhubaneswar Inscriptions of Gaṅga, Narsimha I, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXI, 1955, pp. 81-84.
70. Parbatīya Plates of Vanamālavarman, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 145-59 (with P.D. Chaudhury).
71. Puri Plate of Kulastambha, *ibid.*, pp. 164-69.
72. Bhadrak Inscription of Gaṇa, *ibid.*, pp. 169-74.
73. Ajmer Stone Inscription, *ibid.*, pp. 178-82.
74. Two Grants from Daspalla (1. Plate of Devānanda, Year 184, 2. of Śatrubhaṅja Tribhuvanakalasa, Year 193), *ibid.*, pp. 183-94.
75. Burhīkhār Brāhmī Inscription, *Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc.*, Culture and Heritage Number, 1956, pp. 221-24 (cf. *Proc. IHQ*, Waltair, 1953, pp. 39-41).
76. Fragmentary Inscriptions from Nāgarjunikoṇḍa, *Nagarjunikonda Souvenir*, ed. Rama Rao, Guntur, 1955, pp. 41-45.
77. Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Parishat Plate of Viśvarūpasena, *Journ., As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XX, 1954, pp. 201-08.
78. Madanpūr Plate of Viśvarūpasena, *ibid.*, pp. 209-17.
79. Jaynagar Image Inscription of the Year 35, *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XLI, Part 2, June 1955, pp. 143-53.
80. Bhubaneswar Inscriptions of Anaṅgabhīma III, Aṅka Year 34, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX pp. 17-23.
81. Bhubaneswar Inscription of Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga, *ibid.*, pp. 29-32.
82. Abbottābād Inscription of Kadambeśvaradāsa, Year 25, *ibid.*, pp. 59-62.
83. Baḍagaṅgā Inscription of Bhūtiyaśman, *ibid.*, pp. 62-67.
84. Inscriptions from Bihār (1. Sanskhār Inscription of Ballālasena, Year 9, 2. Lai Inscription of Vikramadevī, 3. Kauleśvarī Hill Inscription of Vishnugupta, 4. An Inscribed Terracotta Plaque), *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, Part III, June 1953, pp. 78-87.
85. Bhubaneswar Inscription of Prmāḍi, Śaka 1064, *ibid.*, pp. 90-94.
86. Ningonḍi Grant of Prabhañjanavarman, *ibid.*, pp. 112-13.
87. Munghala Stone Inscription, Kṛita Year 894, *Journ. U.P. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. III (New Series), Part I, 1955, pp. 1-6.
88. A Fragmentary Inscription from Mathurā, *ibid.*, Vol. II, Part II, 1954, pp. 10-14.
89. Two Inscriptions of Gauri (1. Chhoti Sadre Inscription of Year 547, 2. Mandasor Fragmentary Inscription,) *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, Part IV, October 1953, pp. 120-32.
90. Banda Plates of Parachakraśalya, Sāmvat 56, *ibid.*, pp. 135-40.
91. Two Pratiḥāra Grants from Kureṭhā (1. Plate of Malayavarman, V. S. 1277, 2. of Naravarman, V.S. 1304), *ibid.*, pp. 143-52.
92. Charter of Vishnushoṇa, Sāmvat 649, *ibid.*, Part V. pp. 163-31.
93. Mathurā Image Inscription of Vāsudeva, *ibid.*, pp. 181-84.
94. Two Inscriptions from Jaipur District (1. Inscription of the time of Allāvadīna, V.S. 1360, 2. Todā Raising Inscription of the time of Asalema Sāhi, V.S. 1604, Śaka 1469), *ibid.*, pp. 189-97.
95. Puri Inscriptions of Anaṅgabhīma III, Śaka 1147 and 1158, *ibid.*, pp. 197-203.
96. Two Inscriptions from Bhilsā (1. Inscription of V.S. 935, 2. Eulogy of the Sun god composed by Chhittapa) *ibid.*, pp. 210-19.
97. Bhañja Grant from Khiching, *ibid.*, pp. 220-25.
98. Bhubaneswar Inscription of Bhīmadeva, *ibid.*, pp. 232-36.
99. Two Nāga Inscriptions (1. Takshaka Image Inscription from Lucknow Museum : 2. Patnā Museum Inscription of V.S. 1452 and Śaka 1317), *ibid.*, pp. 237-42.
100. Jaṅgalpāḍu Plates of Śatrubhaṅja, *ibid.*, pp. 250-54.

101. Two Grants of Śaileśvaradeva (1. Purushottampur Plates of Sainyabhūta Mādhavarman, Year 13; 2. Chandesar Plates of Mānabhūta Dharmarāja, Year 18), *ibid.*, Part VII, pp. 264-73.
102. Terāsiṅgā Plates of Tushtikāra, *ibid.*, pp. 274-78.
103. Dūbi Plates of Bhāskaravarman, *ibid.*, pp. 287-304.
104. Ghumli Plate of Būshkaladeva, V.S. 1045 *ibid.*, Vol. XXXI, Part I, pp. 11-16.
105. Alāpur Plates of Narasiṃha II, Śaka 1215, *ibid.*, pp. 17-24 (with P. Acharya).
106. Senakapāṭ Inscription of the time of Śivagupta Bālārjuna, *ibid.*, pp. 31-36 (with M.G. Dikshit).
107. Two Inscriptions from Tripurā State (1. Duitār Bāri Inscription; 2. Mahārānī Inscription of the time of Vijayamānikya). *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXII, June 1957, pp. 99-106.
108. Umāchal Rock Inscription of Surendravarman, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXI, Part II, pp. 65-67 (with P. D. Chaudhury).
109. Jain Inscription from Shergadh, V.S. 1194, *ibid.*, pp. 79-83.
110. Pedda-Dugam Plates of Śatrudamana, Year 9, *ibid.*, pp. 86-96.
111. Asankhāli Plates of Narasiṃha II, Śaka 1225, *ibid.*, pp. 104-22.
112. Two Grants from Galavalli (1. Grant of the time of Devendravarman; 2. of Rājārāja I Devendravarman), *ibid.*, pp. 187-96.
113. Gujarrā Inscription of Aśoka, *ibid.*, pp. 205-10.
114. Rājula-Mṇḍagiri Inscription of Aśoka, *ibid.*, pp. 211-18.
115. Brāhmī Inscription from Kailvan, *ibid.*, pp. 229-31.
116. Dāsgobā Plates of Rājārāja III, Śaka 1120, *ibid.*, pp. 249-62 (with S. Ratha Sarma).
117. Three Plates from Pāṇḍukeśvar (1. Plate of Lalitāśūradeva; 2. of Padmaśūradeva; 3. of Subhiksharājadeva), *ibid.*, pp. 277-98.
118. Bhārat Kalā Bhavan Plate of Hariārāja, V.S. 1040, *ibid.*, pp. 309-13.
119. Inscriptions of the time of Yajvapāla Gopāla (1. Sesai Inscription of V.S. 1341, 2. Bangla Inscriptions, Nos. 1-15), *ibid.*, pp. 323-36.
120. Erraguḍi Edicts of Aśoka, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 1-28.
121. Sopara Fragment of Rock Edict IX of Aśoka, *ibid.*, pp. 29-30.
122. Oriya Part of the Veligalani Grant of Kapilendra, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XXIII, 1957, No. 1 (Meghnad Saha Number), pp. 13-17.
123. Rāshtrakūṭa Grants from Chīñchani, (1. Grant of the time of Indra III; Śaka 848, 2. Plate of the time of Kṛishṇa III), *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXII, Part II, pp. 45-60.
124. Three Grants from Chīñchani (1. Grant of Chāmuṇḍarāja, Śaka 956, 2. of Vijjala, Śaka 969, 3. of Vijjala, Śaka 975), *ibid.*, pp. 61-76.
125. Two Inscriptions from Guntur District (1. Velpuru Inscription of Mānasada; 2. Manchikallu Inscription of Pallava Simhavarman), *ibid.*, pp. 82-90.
126. Vunnaguruwayapalem Plates of Paramēśvaravarman I, Year 19, *ibid.*, pp. 91-98 (with P. Seshadri Sastri).
127. Inscriptions of the Chandras of Arakan (Vesāli Inscriptions of the time of Nīticandra and Vīrachandra), *ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 103-09.
128. Three Chandella Charters (1. Plates of Madanavarman, V.S. 1191; 2. Plate of Paramardin, V.S. 1239; 3. Plate of Paramardin, V.S. 1247), *ibid.*, pp. 118-28.
129. Māndhātā Plates of Paramāra Jayasiṃha-Jayavarman, V.S. 1331, *ibid.*, pp. 139-56.
130. Amudalapadu Plates of Vikramāditya I, Year 5, *ibid.*, pp. 175-84.
131. Pāṭṭali Grant of Yuvarāja Rājendravarman, Gaṅga year 313, *ibid.*, pp. 201-06.
132. Fragmentary Maurya Inscription from Mathurā, *ibid.*, pp. 207-12.
133. Bhubaneswar Inscription of Gaṅga Narasiṃha, *ibid.*, pp. 229-38 (with K.G. Krishnan).
134. Rājghāṭ Inscription of Bhīmadeva, *ibid.*, pp. 277-82.
135. Howraghat Plates of Balavarman III of Kāmarūpa, Year 5, *ibid.*, pp. 283-92.
136. Two Grants of Raghudeva (1. Raghudevapura Grant of Śaka 1378, 2. Dorapalem Grant of 1455-56 A.D.), *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 1-22.
137. Two Inscriptions of the time of Gopāla (1. Baraudi Inscription of V.S. 1336; 2. Narwar Inscription of V.S. 1339), *ibid.*, pp. 31-40.
138. Kapilās Inscriptions of Narasiṃhadeva (Nos. 1-3), *ibid.*, pp. 41-45.
139. Barā Inscription of the time of Pṛithvīrāja III, V.S. 1234, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 299-304.

140. Lāhādapura Inscription of the time of Jayachandra, V.S., 1230, *ibid.*, pp. 305-09.
141. Sonepur Inscription of Bhānudeva. *ibid.*, pp. 325-28.
142. Two Inscriptions of the time of Gaṇapati (1. Surawaya Inscription of V.S. 1350 ; 2. Narwar Inscription of V.S. 1355), *ibid.*, pp. 339-46.
143. Brick Inscription of Dāmamitra, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 99-100.
144. Inscriptions from Gayā (1. Inscription of the time of Kākatiya Pratāparudra I, 2. of the time of Hoysala Narasimha III, 3. of Kṛishṇadevarāya, Śaka 1414, 4. of Achyutarāya, V.S. 1388), *ibid.*, pp. 103-66 (with K.H.V. Sarma).
145. Unchahra Fragmentary Inscription, V.S., 1294, *ibid.*, pp. 121-24.
146. Warangal Inscription of Raghudeva, Kali year 4561, *ibid.*, pp. 125-30.
147. Dhullā Plate of Śrichandra, *ibid.*, pp. 134-40.
148. Chikkalavalasa Plates of Vajrahasta III, Śaka 982, *ibid.*, pp. 141-46.
149. Bhāturiyā Inscription of Rājyapāla, *ibid.*, pp. 150-54.
150. Mallār Plates of Jayarāja, Year 5, *ibid.*, pp. 155-58.
151. Buḍherā Pillar Inscription of V.S. 1351, Śaka 1216, *ibid.*, pp. 163-66.
152. Bhumarā Pillar Inscription of Hastin, *ibid.*, pp. 167-72.
153. Allahābād Museum Plate of Govindachandra. V.S. 1171, *ibid.*, pp. 176-80.
154. Puri Inscription of Choḍagaṅga, *ibid.*, pp. 181-85.
155. Moḍāsā Plate of the time of Paramāra Bhoja, V.S. 1067, *ibid.*, Part V, pp. 192-98.
156. Malgā Plates of Sāmanta Indrarāja, *ibid.*, pp. 209-14 (with S. Sankaranarayanan).
157. Mahudi Plates of Paramāra Bhoja, V.S. 1074, *ibid.*, pp. 215-18.
158. Barhut Inscriptions in the Allahābād Museum, *ibid.*, Part II pp. 57-60.
159. Fragmentary Yajvapāla Inscription from Narwar, *ibid.*, pp. 65-70.
160. Kalyāṇa Inscription of Śaka 1248, *ibid.*, pp. 71-76.
161. Three Inscriptions in the Bāripadā Museum (Inscriptions of Dhruvarāja, Kumārarvarman and yodhabhañja) *ibid.*, pp. 82-84.
162. Davangere Plates of Ravivarman, Year, 34, *ibid.*, pp. 87-92.
163. Veligalani Grant of Kapileśvara, Śaka 1380, *ibid.*, Part VII, pp. 275-92 (with K.H.V. Sarma).
164. Chāṇḍil Stone Inscription, *ibid.*, pp. 297-98.
165. Two Inscriptions of the Gupta Age (1. Kalāchhalā Fragmentary Grant of Isvararāta, 2. Supiā Pillar Inscription of the time of Skandagupta, Gupta year 141), *ibid.*, pp. 303-08.
166. Madanpūrā Plate of Viśvarūpasena, *ibid.*, pp. 315-26.
167. Stray Plate from Nanānā. *ibid.*, pp. 238-46.
168. Footprint Slab Inscription from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, *ibid.*, pp. 247-50 (with A.N. Lahiri).
169. Inscription in Cave IV at Ajanṭā. *ibid.*, pp. 259-62.
170. Fragmentary Inscription from Chitorgadh, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 53-58 (with G.S. Gai).
171. Inscription from Manthani, *ibid.*, pp. 63-76.
172. Grants of Gayāḍatuṅga (1-2. Talcher Plates, Nos. 1 and 2, 3. Asiatic Society's Plate), *ibid.*, pp. 91-104.
173. Brāhmī Inscriptions from Mathurā (1. Inscription of Kanishka's Reign, Year 4, 2. of year 92, 3. of Nṛipamitra), *ibid.*, Part I, pp. 9-13.
174. Two Inscriptions from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa (1. of the time of Ehavala Chantamūla, year 16, 2. of the time of Rudapurisadata, year 11), *ibid.*, pp. 17-22 (with K.G. Krishnan).
175. Tārāchāṇḍī Rock Inscription of Pratāpachavala, V.S. 1225, *ibid.*, 23-27.
176. Dharwar Plates of Sirhāṇa, *ibid.*, pp. 32-41 (with S. Sankaranarayanan).
177. Mallār Plates of Vyāghrarāja, *ibid.*, pp. 45-50 (with G. Bhattacharya).
178. Bonda Plates of Mahāśiva Tivara, year 5, *ibid.*, pp. 111-16.
179. Mudgapadra Grant of Yuvarāja Śrīyāśraya Śilāditya, *ibid.*, pp. 117-22.
180. Verāval Inscription of Chalukya-Vāghelā Arjuna' 1264 A.D., *ibid.*, pp. 141-50.
181. Khaṇḍelā Inscription of Year 201, *ibid.*, pp. 159-63.
182. Two Grants of the Early Guhilas (1. of Bhāvihita, Harsha year 48, 2. of Bābhaṭa, Harsha year 83) *ibid.*, pp. 167-76.
183. Chiruvroli Grant of Hambīra, Śaka 1383, *ibid.*, pp. 177-88 (with K.H.V. Sarma).
184. Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Inscription of Ābhira Vasuśeṇa, year 30, *ibid.*, pp. 197-204.

185. Some Brāhmī Inscriptions (1. Barhut Inscription in the Bhūrat Kalā Bhavan, 2. Fragmentary inscriptions from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, Nos. 1-4), *ibid.*, pp. 207-12.
186. Paṇḍiā Pāthar Plates of Bhimasena, year 89, *ibid.*, pp. 233-38.
187. Some Inscriptions from U.P. (including Fragmentary Inscription of Rudradāmaśī and Iliā Inscription of Manorathavarman), *ibid.*, pp. 243-54.
188. More Inscriptions from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa (with a Glossary), *ibid.*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 1-36.
189. Fragmentary Pillar Inscription from Amārāvātī, *ibid.*, pp. 40-43.
190. Three Early Medieval Inscriptions (1. Kābul Inscription of Shāhī Khingāla, 2. Śitābhīñji Inscription of Diśābhañja, 3. Nausāri Inscription of the time of Yālava Rāmachandra, V.S. 1359), *ibid.*, pp. 44-54.
191. Two Inscriptions from Kalyāṇapur (1. Inscription of the time of Mahārāja Paḍḍa, 2. Inscription of the time of Kadachhi), *ibid.*, pp. 55-59 (with V.S. Subrahmanyam).
192. Sālri Inscription of Chaṇḍeśvarahastin, *ibid.*, pp. 66-68 (with J. Sundaram).
193. Bhaikshuki Inscription in the Indian Museum, *ibid.*, pp. 79-84.
194. Fragmentary Inscription from Dholkā, *ibid.*, pp. 89-94 (with M.R. Majumdar).
195. Fragmentary Rāṣṭrakūṭa Inscription from Kandahār, *ibid.*, pp. 103-14 (with G. Bhattacharya).
196. Two Eastern Gaṇḍa Inscriptions (1. Khilor Inscription of Anantavarman Kāmārṇava, Śaka 1075, 2. Bhubaneśwar Inscription of Rājārāja II, Śaka 1094, Añka 4), *ibid.*, pp. 115-20.
197. Copper-plate Grants from Bihār (1. Grant of Jīvagupā, 2-3. Two Grants of Sauryāditya, V.S. 1077 and 1083, 4. Grant of Bhulla, V.S. 1381), *ibid.*, pp. 125-44.
198. Penugūṇḍa Plates of Hativarman, *ibid.*, pp. 145-50.
199. Some Gāhaḍavāla Grants (1. of Govindachandra, V.S. 1193, 2. of Vijayachandra, V.S. 1217, 3. of Jayachandra, V.S. 1232 and 1233), *ibid.*, pp. 201-20.
200. Three Pāla Inscriptions (1. Guyā Inscription of the time of Nārāyaṇapāla, year 7, 2. Nimdighi Inscription mentioning Gopāla, 3. Guyā Inscription mentioning Govindapāla, V.S. 1232), *ibid.*, pp. 225-38.
201. Two Inscriptions of Durgarāja (1. Pushkar Inscription of V.S. 932 and 994, 2. Thānwālā Inscription of time of Simharāja, V.S. 1013), *ibid.*, pp. 239-46.
202. Devali Plates of Govinda, Valabhi year 500, *ibid.*, pp. 269-80.
203. Amreli Museum Plates of Dhruvasena II Bālāditya, Year 323, *ibid.*, pp. 281-86 (with J. Sundaram).
204. Spurious Grant of Gāhaḍavāla Vijayachandra, V.S. 1223, *ibid.*, pp. 153-58.
205. Two Inscriptions from Nanded District (1. Hortal Inscription of the time of Someśvara, 2. Fragmentary Inscription from Ardhapur), *ibid.*, pp. 159-70 (with G. Bhattacharya).
206. Inscriptions from Maihar, *ibid.*, pp. 171-78 (with V.S. Subrahmanyam).
207. Three Paramāra Inscriptions (1. Bhojpur Fragmentary Inscription of the time of Bhoja I, 2. Bhojpur Inscription of the time of Naravarman, V.S. 1157, 3. Bhilsā Inscription of the time of Jayasimha, V.S. 1320), *ibid.*, pp. 185-88.
208. Inscription of the time of Islām Shāh, A.H. 960, V.S. 1610, *ibid.*, pp. 193-99.
209. Three Copper-plate Charters (1. Dhārikakūṭa Grant of Achaṇḍavarman, year 35, 2. Tiṇḍigrāma Grant of Vikramendra III, year 14, 3. Ekallahūra Grant of Trilochanapāla, Śaka 972), *ibid.*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 1-18.
210. Prakāśa Inscription of Siṃghaṇa's time, Śaka 1156, *ibid.*, pp. 19-22 (with V.S. Subrahmanyam).
211. Two Songirā Chauhān Inscriptions from Bārliṭ, *ibid.*, pp. 33-38 (with K.V. Ramesh).
212. Three Inscriptions from Bihār (1. Silsilā Inscription of Aṅgasimha's time, V.S. 1162, 2. Nongadh Inscription of Mīdanapāla's time, V.S. 1201, 3. Ārmā Inscription of Mīdanapāla's time, year 14), *ibid.*, pp. 39-44.
213. Three Inscriptions from Rājasthān (1. Kusumā Inscription of V.S. 693, 2. Tasaī Inscription of Harsha year 182, 3. Kāmān Inscription of Harsha year 263), *ibid.*, pp. 47-56.
214. Rāshṭrakūṭa Inscription from Rāmeśvara, *ibid.*, pp. 57-68.
215. Śrīśailan Inscription of Kapileśvara, Śaka 1382, *ibid.*, pp. 75-80.
216. Inscriptions of Two Brāhmaṇa Rulers of Gayā (1. Inscription of Viśvāditya, year 15 of Nayapāla, 2. of Viśvarūpa, year 15 of Nayapāla, 3-4. Fragmentary Inscription, year 5 of Vighrapāla, 5. Inscription of Yakshapāla), *ibid.*, pp. 81-94.
217. Ahaurā Inscription of Aśoka, *ibid.*, pp. 239-43.
218. Crystal Intaglio in the British Museum, *ibid.*, pp. 275-84.
219. Inscriptions from Mandār Hill (Nos. 1-2) *ibid.*, pp. 303-06.

VIII

220. Inscribed Terracotta Seal from Raktapittikā, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 25-28.
221. Fragmentary Copper-plate Grant from Arakan, *ibid.*, pp. 61-66.
222. Mahisantosh Image Inscription of Mahendrapāla, year 15, *ibid.*, pp. 204-08.
223. Paśchimbhāg Plate of Śrīchandra, year 5, *ibid.* pp. 289-304.
224. New Delhi Inscription of Aśoka, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 1-4.
225. Brāhmi Inscription from Gaṅgaperūru. *Ind. Mus. Bull.*, July 1966, pp. 51-52.
226. Two Medieval Inscriptions from Eastern India (1. Pāyā Tūreśvarī Temple Inscription of Mukṭādharmānūrāyaṇa, Śaka 1364=1442 A.D., 2. Gayā Prapitāmaheśvara Temple Intcription of Maujadīna, V.S. 1297=1240 A.D., *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. I (1967-68), pp. 17-29.
227. Inscriptions from the Kabilāspur Temple, Śaka 1565, *Ind. Mus. Bud.*, 1968, pp. 7-9.
228. Nilāchal Plates of King Mādhava of Kāmīrūpa, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. II (1968-69), pp. 65-83.
229. Śrīkuṇḍ Stone Inscription of Śaka 1503, *Journ. B. Res. Soc.*, Askari Felicitation Vol., 1968, pp. 334-35.
230. Some Epigraphic and Manuscript Records (1. An Alleged Inscription of Khāavela, 2. Buddhist Dhāraṇīs from China in Inscriptions and Manuscripts), *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. III (1969-70), pp. 23-49.
231. Andhau Fragmentary Inscription of Chashṭana, Year 11, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLVIII, Part II, August 1970, pp. 253-57.
232. Copper-plate Grant of Vīradharadeva of Samātaṭa. *Chhabī* (Bhārat Kalā Bhavan Gold. Jub. Vol.), Banaras, 1971, pp. 104-05.
233. Aśoker Āhaurā Anuśāsan, *Vanṅīya Sāhitya Parishat Patrikā*, Vol. 67, B.S. 1367 pp. 85-89.
234. Vidiśā Inscriptions of Rāmāgupta, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. III (1969-70), pp. 145-51.
235. A Copper-plate Grant of the Tripurā Kings, *ibid.*, Vol. IV (1970-71), pp. 192-95.
236. Umā-Mahesvara Image Inscription from Skandar (Afghanistan), *ibid.*, Vol. VI, pp. 2-4.
237. Three East Indian Inscriptions of the Early Medieval Period (1. Siyān Stone Slab Inscription of the time of Nayapāla ; 2. Bodhgayā Stone Slab Inscription of Buddhacna in the Berlin Museum ; 3. Antichak Stone Pillar Inscription of Māsanikesa), *ibid.*, pp. 39-59.

III. EPIGRAPHY AND PALAEOGRAPHY

1. 'Chāṇḍasutānam' in the Nānāghāṭ Cave Inscription, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. VII, June, 1931, p. 412.
2. Date of the Jirjingi Grant of Indravarman, *Journ. Andh. Hist., Res. Soc.*, Rajahmundry, Vol. VII, April 1983, pp. 229f.
3. Sunderban Plate of Dommanapala. *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. I, April 1935, pp. 379-82.
4. Evidence of the Irda Plate, *Mod. Rev.*, October 1937, pp. 440-41.
5. The Talagunda Inscription, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IV, January 1938, p. 355.
6. Notes on some Inscriptions of the Kings of Valabhī, *Journ. Bomb. Univ.*, Vol. IV, 1935, p. 175.
7. Meaning of 'Anudhyāta', *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. X, 1937-38, p. 229.
8. Epigraphic Notes (Nos. 1-3), *Journ. Great. Ind. Soc.*, Vol. V, 1938, pp. 154ff.
9. Date of the Earliest Sanskrit Inscription of Champā, *ibid.*, Vol. VI, January, 1939, pp. 53.
10. Kesari Plate of Śatrubhañja, *Ind. Hist. Quart.* Vol. XV, June 1938, pp. 306-10.
11. Dāmodarpur Grant of the time of Budhagupta, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. V, April 1939, pp. 432f.
12. Vatsagulma Grant of Vākāṭaka Vindhyaśakti, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVI, March 1940, pp. 182-86.
13. 'Vāmadeva-pād-anudhyata', *N. Ind. Ant.*, April 1940, pp. 36-37.
14. The Auspicious Symbol at the Beginning of Inscriptions, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Calcutta, 1939, pp. 471-74.
15. Date of the Earliest Sanskrit Inscription of Champā, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVII, March 1941, pp. 107-110.
16. Spuriousness of the Nālandā Grant of Samudragupta, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 135-36.
17. On Some Words in the Inscriptions of Aśoka, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VII, 1941, pp. 487-89.
18. Mathurā Inscription of Chandragupta II, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVIII, September 1942, pp. 271-75.
19. Basim Copper-Plate Inscription of Vākāṭaka Vindhyaśakti II, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VIII, 1942, pp. 384ff.

IX

20. 'Pārimda' in the Inscription of Aśoka, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VIII, 1942, pp. 399-400.
21. Some Early Rāja-śāsanas, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Lahore, 1940, pp. 52-56.
22. *Samavāya* and *Niludhasi pi khalasi* in the Inscriptions of Aśoka, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Hyderabad, 1941, pp. 144-45.
23. Meaning of 'Pād-ānudyāta,' *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IX, 1943, pp. 115-18.
24. Bargaṅgā Stone Inscription of Bhūti-varman, *Journ. Assam Res. Soc.*, Gauhati, Vol. X, 1943, pp. 63-67.
25. Kālībhanā Grants, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XX, December 1944, p. 364.
26. The Ponduru Grant and the Gaṅga Era, *Journ. Kal. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. I, 1946, pp. 219-21.
27. Bajaur Casket of the Reign of Menander, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 318-21.
28. Anuśāsan, *Vaṅgiya Mahākosh* (Encyclopaedia Bengalensis), Calcutta, Vol. II, No. 18, pp. 570-76.
29. Sāmudraguptar Nālandā Tāmraśāsan, Udbodhan (Bengali) B.S. 1347, pp. 462-64.
30. Nālandāte Āviskṛita Pālavamāsiya Samrāt Devapāler Tāmraśāsan, *Sumatra* by Sadananda Giri, Calcutta, B.S. 1347, pp. 28-34.
31. Govindachandrer Lekh, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Asvin, B.S. 1350, pp. 345-47.
32. Tṛitiya Gopāladever Rājāpur-lipir Tārikh, *Udbodhan* (Bengali), Paush, B.S. 1349, pp. 703-05.
33. Śīrabhasureśvar Narendrer Navāviskṛita Tāmraśāsan, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Ashādh, B.S. 1350, pp. 12-13.
34. Govindachandrer Paikpārā-lipir Tārikh, *Vaṅgaśrī* (Bengali), Asvin, B.S. 1350, pp. 345-47.
35. Kālāikūri Tāmraśāsan, *ibid.*, Agrahāyan, B.S. 1350, p. 780.
36. Samatāṭer Rāta Rājavamāsa, *Bhāratavarsha*, Vaiśākh, B.S. 1353, pp. 369-74.
37. Samatāṭeśvar Śrīdhārāṇa Rāter Tāmraśāsan, *Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Parishat Patrikā* (Bengali), Vol. LIV pp. 15-17; *Udbodhan* Golden Jubilee Volume, B.S. 1354, pp. 21-24.
38. Fractions in an Early Inscription, *Journ. Univ. Gauhati*, Vol. I, No. I, 1950, pp. 133-36.
39. Udamāna in Bengal Epigraphs, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVI, 1950, pp. 309-13.
40. Some Karaśāsanas of Ancient Orissa, *Journ. R. As. Soc.* 1952, pp. 4-10.
41. Some Inscriptions in the Collection of the Asiatic Society, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XVIII, 1952, pp. 1-4.
42. Note on Purī Plates of Bhānu II, *Journ. B. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XXXVIII, 1952, pp. 225-29.
43. Prāchīn Uḍishyār Karaśāsan, *Itihās* (Bengali) Vol. II, B.S. 1358, pp. 115-20.
44. Tṛitiya Vighrahapāler Nūtan Tāmraśāsan, *Pravāsi* (Bengali), B.S. 1358, Part II, pp. 571-72.
45. Gauḍer Rājamantri Bhīmadev, *ibid.*, B.S. 1359, Part II, pp. 559-60.
46. Uḍishyāy Bhaumavamāser Rājatvakāl, *ibid.*, B.S. 1360, Part I, pp. 338-40.
47. Viśvarūpasener Tāmraśāsan, *ibid.*, Chaitra, 1360 B.S., pp. 710-13.
48. Eastern Gaṅga Inscriptions in the Tamil Country, *Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc.*, Vol. XLIII, Nos. 3-4 1953, pp. 95-101.
49. Epigraphic Notes (1. Pherava Grant of Sāmantavarman, 2. Koni Inscription of Prithivīdeva II, 3. Madanpur Plate of Srichandra, 4. Kulkuri and Berkā Inscriptions of Govindachandra, 5. Tekkali Plates of Anantavarman) *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 335 ff.
50. Notes and Queries (1. Śaka Era in South India, 2. Karaśāsanas of Ancient Orissa), *Ind. Hist. Quart.* Vol. XXIX, 1953, pp. 294-303.
51. The Mātbaras of Kaliṅga, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.* Vol. II, 1953, pp. 57-60.
52. Accession of Gajapati Bhānu IV, *Journ. Or. Res.* Vol. XXII, 1952-53, pp. 47-52.
53. An Inscription in the Paṭṇā Museum, *Ind. Hist. Quart.* Vol. XXIX, 1953, pp. 395-99.
54. Palaeography of the Sailodbhava Grants, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.* Vol. III, No. 1, 1954 pp. 31-34.
55. Indian Epigraphy, *Indo—As. Cult.*, Vol. III, 1954-55, pp. 327-37; Vol. IV pp. 99-107.
56. Date of the Imādpur Inscription of Mahipāla I, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXX, December 1954, pp. 382-87.
57. Inscriptions in Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages, *Ancient India*, No. 9, 1953, pp. 212-24.
58. Note on the Dhuleb Plate of Mahārāja Bhatti, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXX, pp. 5-7.
59. Epigraphic Notes (1. Rākshaskhālī-Sundarban Plate of Dommanapāla, 2. Saugar Inscription of Saṅkaragaṇa, 3. Mehār Plate of Dāmodara, Śaka 1156, Regnal Year 4), *ibid.*, pp. 42-58.
60. Note on Two Plates of Tribhuvanamahādevī from Baud, *ibid.*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 220-24.
61. Ballālsener Navāviskṛita Lipi, *Pravāsi* (Bengali), Bhādra, B.S. 1361, pp. 564-66.
62. Navāviskṛita Aśoklipi, *Itihās* (Bengali), Vol. VII, No. 1, B.S. 1363, pp. 23-28.

X

63. North Indian Inscriptions, *Tamil Encyclopedia* (Tamil), Vol. III.
64. New Inscriptions of Aśoka, *Indo-As. Cult.*, Vol. V, No. 3, January 1957, pp. 282-95.
65. Eran Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta, *Journ. U. P. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. III (New Series), 1955, Part II, pp. 91-100.
66. Note on Mādāgrāma Grant of Devēndravarmān and Bhīmakhēḍi, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXXI, Part II, pp. 53-55.
67. Some New Indian Inscriptions, *Indo. As. Cult.*, Vol. VI, April 1958, pp. 422-35.
68. Note on Two Eastern Gaṅga Inscriptions at Kāñchīpuram, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 98ff.
69. Note on the Kurud Plates of Narendra, Year 24, *ibid.*, pp. 267-68.
70. Chandella Grants in the Bhārata Kalā Bhavan, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXIV, June 1958, pp. 87-95.
71. Note on the Bhāturiyā Inscription of Bājyapāla, *ibid.*, September and December 1958, pp. 276-80.
72. Dāśārathidēv Nūtan Tāmrāsāsan, *Itihās* (Bengali), Vol. VIII, No. 3, B.S. 1364-65, pp. 160-63.
73. Epigraphic Notes (1. Creation of Rent-free Holdings. 2. Khajjana = Khajjān = Khajjanaka, 3. Paṅga = Paṅgā = Pāṅga), *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 50-56.
74. Note on the Mandasor Inscription of Gauri, *ibid.*, pp. 205-08.
75. Note on the Shar-i-Kura Inscription of Aśoka, *ibid.*, pp. 333-37.
76. Note on the Senakapāt Inscription, *ibid.*, pp. 255-56.
77. Note on the Rānagiri Plate of Somavarmā Karna, *ibid.*, pp. 269-74.
78. Note on the Nesarikā Plates of Govinda III, Śaka 727, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 135-40.
79. Note on the Inscription of Chaulukya Karna, V.S. 1354, *ibid.*, pp. 155-58 (with G. Bhattacharya).
80. Note on the Wadagiri Inscription of Chaulukya V.S. 1, *ibid.*, pp. 193-96.
81. Note on the Hilol Plates of Year 470, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 219-22.
82. Epigraphic Notes (1. Sarabhaṅga = Sarabhaṅga = Sarabhaṅga, 2. Devadāsīs in Buddhist Temples, 3. Dvārakaṭaka, 4. Ambakipilika = Amba-kapilika = Amba-kaṭilika, 5. Date of the Dabok Inscription), *ibid.*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 95-102.
83. Note on the Malleśvaram Inscription of Trailokyamalla, *ibid.*, pp. 261-68.
84. Epigraphic Notes (1. Meaning of 'upagata' etc., 2. Haṁyamana = Hañjamana = Hañjamāna = Añjuvannam), *ibid.*, pp. 287-92.
85. Note on the Inscription from Wari, *ibid.*, pp. 183-84.
86. Note on the Inscription of Nripamitra, *ibid.*, p. 200.
87. Note on the Aphsad Inscription of Adityasena, *ibid.*, pp. 185-88.
88. Note on the Rājghāt Inscription of Bhīmadeva, *ibid.*, pp. 245-46.
89. Note on the Chīñchani Plate of Kṛishṇa III, *ibid.*, pp. 277-78.
90. Kandahar Edict of Aśoka, *Indo-As. Cult.*, Vol. VIII, No. 4, April 1960, pp. 357-63.
91. Epigraphic Notes (1. Bhadrak Inscription of Gaṇa, 2. Capital of the Later Aulikaras, 3. Kolagallu and Kudatini Inscriptions, 967 and 971 A.D.), *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXVI, Nos. 2-3, June-September 1960, pp. 189-202.
92. Drevnie Indiiskie Nadpisi, *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Otdelnyi Ottisk (Russian)), 1962, pp. 28-48.
93. Forgery of Epigraphic Records, *Reunion Souvenir*, AIHC, C.U., 1964, pp. 19-21.
94. Maukhari Inscription from Jaunpur, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLII, part I, April 1964, pp. 127-30.
95. Vivutha = Vyūtha = Vyūṭha, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXVIII, Nos. 2-3, June-September 1962, pp. 222-24.
96. Some Technical Terms in Inscriptions, *Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc.*, Vol. LI, No. 1, April 1960, pp. 1-4.
97. An Alleged Inscription of Rāshtrakūta Kṛishṇa III, *Proc. AIOC* (Srinagar, 1961), pp. 144-50.
98. Date of the Ellora Plates of Dantidurga, *Kavirāja Abhinandana Grantha* (Gopīnāth Kavirāj Fel. Vol.), Lucknow, 1967, pp. 481-82.
99. Date of the Hisse-Borala Inscription of Vākāṭaka Devāsena, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. I (1967-68), pp. 94-98.
100. Palaeographical and Epigraphical Evidence on Kaṇishka's Date, *Papers on the Date of Kanishka*, ed. A.L. Basham Leiden, 1968, pp. 278-92.
101. Recent Studies in the Epigraphic Records of Assam, *Ind. Mus. Bull.*, January 1969, pp. 39-42.
102. Aśoka's Edicts for the Yavanas and Kambojas, *Foreigners in Ancient India*, etc., ed. Sircar, 1970, pp. 25-34.

103. Indological Notes (1. Date of the Manuwar Image Inscription of the time of Kumāragupta I, 2. Nihilapati = Nihelapati), *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.* Vol. III (1969-70), pp. 133-51.
104. Aśoker Kandahar Anuśāsan Itihās, Vol. IX, Part III, B.S. 1365-66, pp. 143-54.
105. Aśoker Pañcam Stambhānuśāsan Sarpārke Ekṣi Kathā *ibid.*, Vol. X, Parts 1-2, B.S. 1366-67, pp. 31-33.
106. Jāl Śilālekḥ O Tāmraśāsan, Abhedānanda Academy, Vārshikī, 1964, pp. 81-86.
107. Maynāmātīr Chandravāmśīya Tāmraśāsantray, *Abdul Karim Sahitya Viśārad Com. Vol.*, Darṣa, 1972, pp. I-VIII.
108. Note on the Prabhas Pātan Plate, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, 1966, pp. 79-80.
109. Kharoshthī Bhāratkosh (Bengali), Vol. III, pp. 15-16.

IV. POLITICAL HISTORY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS

1. Genealogy of the Śālaṅkāyanas, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. IX, March 1933, pp. 208 ff.
2. Genealogy of the Vishnukundins *ibid.*, pp. 273 ff.
3. Chronology of the Vishnukundins, *ibid.*, December 1933, pp. 957 ff.
4. Javavarman of the Kondamudi Grant, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, 1933-34, p. 106.
5. Name of the Last Great Śātavāhana King, *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, July 1934 pp. 560 ff.
6. Genealogy of the Ananda Kings of Guntur, *ibid.*, October 1934, pp. 732-33.
7. Date of Śālaṅkāyana Devavarman, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. I, January 1935, pp. 499-502.
8. Mahārāja Chandavarman of the Komarti Grant, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. X, December 1934, pp. 780-84.
9. Date of Pallava Śivaskandavarman, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XIII, December 1934, pp. 297-302.
10. The Maukharis and the Mālavas, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. I, April 1935, p. 583-84.
11. Kadamba Krishnavarman I, *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Ins.*, Vol. XVI, 1934-35, pp. 160-63.
12. Śrī-Prithivī-vallabha, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. II, July 1935, pp. 131-33.
13. Genealogy and Chronology of the Vishnukundins, *Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc.* Vol. XXIV, April 1935, pp. 299-301.
14. Early History of the Kāñchi Region (The Early Pallavas), *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XIV, August 1935, pp. 149-57.
15. Rise of the Pallavas (The Early Pallavas), *ibid.*, pp. 157-64.
16. Date of Kadamba Mṛgeśavarman, *ibid.*, December 1935, pp. 344-46.
17. Sawai Jaysingh of Amber, A.D. 1699-1743, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. III, October 1938, pp. 376-79.
18. Kadamba Krishnavarman I and his Successors, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XV, December 1936, pp. 301-19.
19. Janamejaya and Janaka, *Ind. Cult.*, April 1937, pp. 747-51.
20. Notes (1. Achyutavikrama, the Chola King; 2. Hindu Names in a Persian Work), *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. X, 1937-38, pp. 227 ff.
21. The Southern Kekayas, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IV, April 1938, pp. 516-20.
22. Kadamba Mayūrasārman, *N. Ind. Ant.*, Vol. I, July 1938, pp. 240-48.
23. Dates of Some Kākatīya Records, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XIV, June 1938, pp. 340-44.
24. King Śātakarṇi of the Sāñchi Inscription, *N. Ind. Ant.*, F. W. Thomas Vol. I, 1938, pp. 291 ff. Cf. *Proc. A.I. Or. Conf.*, Trivandrum, 1937, pp. 686-90.
25. The Ananda and Vishnukundin Kings of the Andhradeśa, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XI, 1938, pp. 129 ff.
26. Bengal and the Rājputs, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Allahabad 1938, pp. 193-200.
27. The Successors of the Śātavāhanas, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XII, April 1939, pp. 236-237.
28. Yuvarāja Divākara, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VI, April 1940, pp. 478-79.
29. Digvijaya of King Chandra of the Mehrauli Pillar Inscription, *Journ. R. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. V, 1939, pp. 407-14.
30. 'Baimbikānām Kuluvratam', *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Calcutta, 1939, pp. 475-76.
31. Kākavarṇa, King of Magadha, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VII, October 1940, pp. 255-57.
32. Was Berar the Home Province of the Śātavāhanas? *Journ. Num. Soc. Ind.*, Vol. III, June 1941, pp. 61-64.
33. Aśoka's Pacifism and the Yugaṇurāṇa Section of the Gārgīsamhitā, *Cal. Rev.*, April 1943, pp. 41-42.

XII

34. Genealogy of the Somavamśis. *Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XX, March 1944, pp. 76-82.
35. The Last Years of Aśoka, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. XI, pp. 40-41.
36. Harsha and Bhāskaravarman, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Aligarh, 1943, pp. 48-51.
37. The Bhavishyottara Purāṇa and Early Gupta History, *Journ. Num. Soc. Ind.*, Vol. VI, June 1944, pp. 34-36.
38. King Vikramāditya and His Samvat, *The Nationalist*, Pujah Number, 1945, p. 25.
39. Aśvamedhas celebrated by the kings of Kāmarūpa, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXI, June 1945, pp. 143-45.
40. A king of Kanauj, *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. VI, November-December 1945, pp. 237-40.
41. Rudradeva and Nāgadatta of the Allahābād Pillar Inscription, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Madras, 1944, pp. 78-81.
42. The Era of the Gaṅgas of Kalinga, *The Nationalist*, Pujah Number, 1946, pp. 133-34.
43. Vikrama Samvat, *Proc. and Trans. A. I. Or. Conf.*, Banaras, 1943-44, pp. 510-11.
44. Who overthrew the Kushāṇa Empire? *ibid.*, pp. 316-17.
45. Kushāṇa Chronology, *ibid.*, p. 519.
46. Harsha and Dhruvabhata. *ibid.*, pp. 524-27.
47. The Maukharis and the Later Guptas. *Journ. R. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XI, 1945, 49-74.
48. The Later Somavamśis, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXII, December 1946, pp. 300-07.
49. History of the Eastern Deccan, Chapter IV of *The Vakātaka-Gupta Age (New History of the India People, Vol. VI, 1946)*, edited by R.C. Majumdar and A.S. Altekar, Patna, 1946, pp. 64-92.
50. King Durgarāja of the Śarabhapurīya Dynasty, *Ind. Hist.*, *Quart.* Vol. XXII, March 1946, pp. 62-63.
51. The Mahārājas Śvāmīdāsa, Bhrikunḍa and Rudraśāsa, *ibid.*, pp. 61-65.
52. A king of Kanauj, *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. VIII, 1947, pp. 102-03.
53. The Vakātakas, *Journ. R. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XII, 1946, pp. 71-73.
54. Notes and Queries (1. Ghatotkachagupta; 2. Govindagupta; 3. Paramatthātāraka-pād-anudhyāta Mahārājas), *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIV, 1948, pp. 71-79.
55. Andhra, *Vaṅgiya Mahākosh* (Encyclopaedia Bengalensis) Calcutta, Vol. II.
56. Samudragupta O Chandragupter Rājavakāl, *Bhāratvarsha* (Bengali), Chaitra, B.S. 1348, pp. 220 ff. *ibid.*, B.S. 1349, p. 193.
57. Gupta Samrātganer Adivās, *ibid.*, Chaitra, B.S. 1349, pp. 263-64.
58. Uttar Bāṅglāy Mahārāj Gupter Adhikār, *ibid.*, Bhādra, B.S. 1350, pp. 193-94.
59. Harsha, Dhruvabhata O Bhāskaravarmā, Śrībhārati (Bengali), Bhādra, B.S. 1350, pp. 16-22.
60. Itihāse tathā Janārutike Rājā Vikramāditya, *Vikram-Nibandh-Sangrah* (Hindi), Cawnpore, 1948, pp. 62-65.
61. Uḍishyār Somavamśa, *Pravasi* (Bengali), Bhādra, B.S. 1351, pp. 363-66.
62. Kāmarūp-rājaganer Aśvamedh-yajña, *Prāchyavāṇī-mandir-Prabandhāvali* (Bengali), Vol. II, pp. 5-9.
63. Vikramāditya, *Varshaśrī* (Bengali), Śārādīyā Samkhyā, B.S. 1332, pp. 46-47.
64. Haihay-kuler Śāryāta Śaktā, *Vaṅgiya Sahitya Parishat Patrika*, (Bengali), Vol. LII, B.S. 1352, pp. 25-34.
65. Was Berar the Home Province of the Śatavāhanas? *Journ. Num. Soc. Ind.*, Vol. III, Part II, 1941, pp. 87-83.
66. Vaṅgadeśe Kambojaganer Rājatva, *Kayastha Patrika* (Bengali), Śrāvāṇa, B.S. 1345, pp. 111-13.
67. Two Dynasties of Ancient Orissa (1. The Śailodbhavas, 2. The Mēnas), *Journ. Kal. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol II, 1947, pp. 39-41.
68. The Bhauma-Karas, *ibid.*, pp. 103-05.
69. The Lichchhavis of Vaiśālī, *Vaisali Abhinandana Grantha*, Muzaffarpur, pp. 73-74.
70. The Vikrama Samvat, *Vikrama VOLUME*, edited by R.K. Mookerji, Ujjain, 1948, pp. 557-86.
71. Great Conquerors of Orissan History, *A. B. Patrika*, Calcutta, January 22, 1950.
72. Date of Śīśurāṭa, *Journ. R. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XV, 1949, pp. 125-26.
73. Mahāśamanta-Mahārāja Viṣṇubhata (Viṣṇubhata) *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXV, 1949, pp. 287-91.
74. Śabī-rājyer patan, *Bhāratvarsha*, B.S. 1355, Magh, pp. 89-93.
75. Oḍishār Rājā Dapḍimabadevi, *Prajatantra* (Oriya), Cuttack, December 25, 1950.

76. Kalingadeśe Gupta-adhikār, Pravāsī. Phalgun. B.S. 1355, pp. 415-17.
77. Pāl-vamśīya Madanapāl O Govindapāl, *Bhāratavarsha*, B.S. 1357, Āshādh pp. 41-45.
78. Shashtha-Saptam Śātūbdīr Gauḍ-Kāmarūp Saṅgharsha, *Itihās* (Bengali), Vol. I, No. 1, B.S. 1357, pp. 12-15.
79. Chhaṭhī va Sā vī Sadīme Gauḍ-Kāmrūp Saṅgharsha, *Itihās* (Hindi), Delhi, November 1950, pp. 894-96.
80. Gaṅga Arkeśvara of Orissa, *Journ. Or. Res.*, Vol. XVII, June 1948, pp. 216-17.
81. Gupta Rule in Orissa, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVI, 1950, pp. 75-79.
82. Kaliṅga and the Imperial Guptas, C.S. Srinivasachari Vol., Madras 1950, pp. 70-73.
83. The Dhavala Ruling Family of Orissa, *Journ. Dakkan Hist. Cult.*, Hyderabad. Vol. I, No. 1, 1950, pp. 14-17.
84. The Dominions of the Śulkī of Orissa, *Journ. Or. Res.*, Vol. XVIII, 1949, pp. 45-48.
85. New Facts about the Bhauma-Karas, *ibid.*, pp. 49-51.
86. Gauḍa-Kāmarūpa Struggle in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVI, 1950, pp. 241-46.
87. Vilivāyakura and Sivalakura, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Cult.*, Vol. V, 1947-48, p. 82.
88. Chronology of the Śailodbhavas, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVII, 1949, pp. 166-69.
89. Śaka Era in South India, *ibid.*, pp. 174-76.
90. Jājpur and the Bhauma-Karas of Orissa, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters. Vol. XVII, 1951, pp. 15-17.
91. Accession of Gajapati Bhānu IV, *Journ. Or. Res.*, Vol. XXII, 1953, pp. 395-99.
92. Some Ancient Kings of Kumaun and Garhwal, *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. XII, 1951, pp. 149-51.
93. The Bhañjas of Kṣiṅjalimaṇḍala, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVIII, 1952, pp. 225-31.
94. The Vishṇukundins, *An. Bhānd. Or. Res. Inst.*, Vol. XXXIII, 1952, pp. 222-28.
95. Harsha's Accession and Era, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIX, 1953, pp. 72-79.
96. An Important Date in the Chronology of the Pālas, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XVII, 1951, pp. 27-31.
97. The Yavanas, Chapter VII of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. II—*The Age of Imperial Unity*, edited by R. C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1951, pp. 101ff.
98. The Śakas and the Pahlavas, *ibid.*, Chapter VIII, pp. 120ff.
99. The Kushāṇas, *ibid.*, Chapter IX, pp. 136ff.
100. Northern India after the Kushāṇas, *ibid.*, Chapter XI, pp. 159ff.
101. The Śaka Satraps of Western India, *ibid.*, Chapter XII, pp. 178ff.
102. The Śātavāhanas and the Chedis, *ibid.*, Chapter XIII, pp. 191ff.
103. The Deccan after the Śātavāhanas, *ibid.*, Chapter XIV, pp. 217ff.
104. Śālivāhana and the Śaka Era, *Journ. Or. Res.*, Vol. XIX, 1950, pp. 42-43.
105. Neṭṭabhañja an ancient king of Orissa, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. I, 1952-53, pp. 60-62.
106. A Rāshṭrakūṭa Ruling family of Orissa, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XIX, 1946, pp. 131-33.
107. Harsha's Accession and the Harsha Era, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVII, 1951, pp. 321-27.
108. An Ancient King of Utkala, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. I, 1952, pp. 22-26.
109. The Era of the Bhauma-Karas of Orissa, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIX, 1953, pp. 148-55.
110. Some Southern Dynasties in Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, *Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc.*, Vol. XLIV, 1953, pp. 1-14.
111. The Later Somavamśis, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. I, No. 4, 1953, pp. 289-300.
112. The Mādala Pāñji and Pre-Sūryavamśī History of Orissa, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XXXI, 1953, pp. 233-46.
113. New Facts of the Reign of Vīgrahapāla III, *Journ. Univ. Gauhati*, Vol. IV, 1953, pp. 107-12.
114. Rāṇā Udayasīma and the Śūr Emperors of Delhi, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXX, 1954, pp. 25-30.
115. Some Minor Dynasties of Orissa, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. II, 2, 1953, pp. 13-20.
116. The Deccan in the Gupta Age, Chapter XI of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. III—*The Classical Age*, edited by R.C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1954, pp. 177-226.
117. The Chālukyas, *ibid.*, Chapter XII, pp. 227-54.
118. Genealogy and Chronology of the Pallavas, *ibid.*, Appendix to Chapter XIII, pp. 275-83.
119. Ceylon, *ibid.*, Chapter XIV, pp. 284-90.
120. Kalachuri Sāhasika of Tripurī, *Journ. U. P. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. XXV-XXVI, 1951-52, pp. 228-32.
121. Madanapāla and his Successors, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XX, 1954, pp. 43-48.

122. New Facts about the Senas, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXX, 1954, pp. 205-18.
123. Rāṇa Udayasiṃha's Relations with Islām Shāh, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXI, September 1955, pp. 273-75.
124. Gupta Sāmrajyē Avasthā, *Itihās.*, Vol. V, B.S. 1361, pp. 1-6.
125. Kumaun and Garhwal, Section XII of Chapter V of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. IV—*The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, edited by R.C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1955, pp. 122-24.
126. The Deccan (c. 750—1000 A.D.) *ibid.*, Chapter VI, pp. 132-40.
127. Genealogy and Chronology of the Pallavas, *ibid.*, Chapter VII, Appendix, pp. 165-67.
128. Ceylon, *ibid.*, Chapter VIII, pp. 168-76.
129. Some Facts of Early Orissan History, (1. Ancient Orissa, 2. Gupta Rule in Orissa, 3. The Bhauma-Karas), *Journ. Ind. His.*, Vol. XXXIV, 1955, pp. 263-305.
130. Some facts of Early Orissan History (4. Anangabhima III), *ibid.*, Vol. XXXV, 1956, pp. 75-89.
131. Yajvapāla Gopāla, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXII, December 1956, pp. 399-405.
132. Some Performers of Aśvamedha, *Sundaram Pillai Com. Vol.*, Madras, 1957, pp. 93-97.
133. Early Kalachuris in Malwa, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXIII, 1957, pp. 235-42.
134. Spread of the Mālava Era, *Proc. IHC*, Gwalior, 1952, pp. 371-74.
135. End of the Gupta Empire, *Jadunath Sarkar Vol.*, Punjab University, 1958, pp. 343-47.
136. The Sūryavarṃśī Gajapatis of Orissa, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXIII, December 1957, pp. 275-87.
137. Dynasties of the Eastern Deccan (1. Somavarṃśis, 2. Nāgas or Chhindakas, 3. Cholas or Telugu-Chodas, 4. Rāshtrakūṭas, 5. Tailapavarṃsis), Sections IV-VIII of Chapter VIII of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. V—*The Struggle for Empire*, edited by R.C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1957, pp. 209-25.
138. Ceylon, *ibid.*, Chapter XII, pp. 261-68.
139. Lakshmanasena Samvat, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXIV, March 1958, pp. 21-28.
140. King Viśākhaṃitra of Magadha, *G.D. College Bull.*, Begusarai, No. 4, 1959, Article No. 6.
141. New Light on the Paramāra Dynasty, *Journ. Assam Res. Soc.*, Vol. XIII (K.L. Barua Vol.), 1959, pp. 23-26.
142. New Light on the Early Guhilas, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. VIII, July 1959, pp. 83-86.
143. The Kaṇishka Era, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XXXVIII, Part I, April 1960, pp. 185-88.
144. New Light on the Ikshvākus and the Pallavas, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXVI, 1960, pp. 23-28.
145. Gopāla III, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. IV, 1962, No. 1, pp. 5-7.
146. The Gandak Valley in the Early Medieval Period, *Bhāratī*, Varanasi, No. 7, Parts I-II, 1963-64, pp. 49-52.
147. Foreign Relations of the Chandras of Eastern Bengal, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLII, Part III, December 1964, pp. 661-66.
148. The Reckoning of the Kathika Kings, *Journ. Or. Res.*, Vol. XIV, 1965, pp. 336-39.
149. Archaeological Evidence for the Reconstruction of Early Indian History, *Ind. Mus. Bull.*, No. 1, January, 1966, pp. 10-16.
150. Vajayavarman the Viceroy of Gopachandra, *Ind. Stud. Past Pres.*, Vol. VII, 1966, pp. 123-26.
151. Madanapāla and the Gāhaḍavālas, *Ind. Mus. Bull.*, Vol. II, July 1967, pp. 26-28.
152. Myth of the Great Bhārata War, *The Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies*, edited by Sircar, Calcutta, 1969, pp. 18-27.
153. Nature of the Purāṇic Genealogies, *ibid.*, pp. 105-14.
154. Indological Notes (1. Derivation of the Clan or Family name 'Maurya' 2. Ptolemy's Notes on Some Localities), *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. V (1971-72), pp. 242-52.
155. Madhyadeśe Bālbhīk-vāsī Yavaner Abhiyān, *Itihās* (Bengali), Vol. XI, B.S. 1367-68, pp. 138-50.
156. Daksbin-pūrva Bāṅglūr Chandra-rājvarṃśa, *Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Parishat Patrika*, Vol. LXVII, B.S. 1367, pp. 1-7.
157. Kesarī-varṃśa, *Bhāratkosh*, Vol. II, 1966, p. 438.
158. Khāravela, *ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 30-31.
159. Gaṅga-varṃśa, *ibid.*, pp. 55-57.
160. Gaṅgeyadeva Kalachuri, *ibid.*, p. 98.
161. Gautamīputra Śatakarni, *ibid.*, pp. 221-22.
162. Chālukya-varṃśa, *ibid.*, pp. 324-27.

163. Chola-vaṁśa, *ibid.*, pp. 395-96.
164. Nāyaka-vaṁśa, *ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 200-02.
165. Paramāra-vaṁśa, *ibid.*, pp. 304-05.
166. Pallava-vaṁśa, *ibid.*, pp. 321-22.
167. Pulakeśi, *ibid.*, pp. 402-03.
168. Jaina Tradition regarding Yaśovarman's Lineage, *Chhotelal Jain Vol.*, Calcutta, 1967, pp. 123-31.

V. GEOGRAPHY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS

1. Capital of the Brīhatphalāyanas, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. VII, January 1933, pp. 170ff.
2. Udayapurānagara, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Calcutta, Vol. IX, June 1933, pp. 584.
3. Gonarda the Cradle of the Gonardiya, translated from Sylvain Levi, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, Part 3, January 1935, pp. 1ff.
4. Kaṭāhangara in the Kaumudīmahotsava, *Journ. Great. Ind. Soc.*, Vol. V, January 1938, pp. 59-60.
5. Kuśadvīpa, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VII, p. 111.
6. The Vāhlikas of the Meharauli Pillar Inscription, *P.V. Kane Presentation Vol.*, Poona, 1941 pp. 469-71.
7. An Account of the 55 Countries in and on the Borders of India, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VIII, July 1941, pp. 32-64.
8. The City of Bengala, *Bhār. Vid.*, Bombay, 1945, pp. 34-42.
9. Kālapriya and Brahmasīlā, *ibid.*, Vol. VI, June, 1945, pp. 123-25. Cf. p. 240.
10. Kokāmukha-tīrtha, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Calcutta, Vol. XXI, March 1945, pp. 56-60.
11. The Vākātakas and the Daśārṇa Country, *ibid.*, pp. 61-62.
12. Text of the Purāṇic List of Peoples, *ibid.*, pp. 297-314.
13. The Vākātakas and the Āsmaka Country, *ibid.*, Vol. XXII, September 1946, pp. 233-35.
14. The Location of Malaya, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXII, December 1946, pp. 315.
15. Origin of the name 'Bengal', *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 62-65.
16. Kuntala and Āsmaka, *ibid.*, pp. 65-68.
17. Vaṅgālanagarī, *Śrībharatī* (Bengali), Jyāishṭha, B.S. 1348, pp. 627-29.
18. Rahma, Bhāṭī evaṁ Vaṅgāladeśa, *Udbodhan* (Bengali), Vaiśākh, B.S. 1349, pp. 177-78.
19. Ariyal Khān Nodīr Nām, *ibid.*, Āśvin, pp. 520-21.
20. Chakravartī evaṁ Chakravartī-kshetra, *Bhāratvarsha* (Bengali) Kārttik, B.S. 1350, pp. 353-56.
21. Kokāmukh Tīrtha, *ibid.*, Āshādh, B.S. 1352, pp. 1-4.
22. Dhākā-nagarīr Nām, *Pravāsī* (Bengali), Kārttik, B.S. 1352, pp. 75-77.
23. Gaṅgā-sāgar-saṁgam, *Hindusthān* (Bengali), Śārādīyā Saṁkhyā, B.S. 1352, pp. 17-18.
24. The City of Gaṅgā, *Proc. I.H.C.*, Bombay, 1947, pp. 91-98.
25. Notes and Queries (1. Kulāchala Malaya, 2. Kuntala and the Māna country in Southern Maharashtra), *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIV, 1948, pp. 78-79.
26. The Ancient City and District of Krimilā, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVI, 1950, pp. 291-94.
27. The Mahishas and the Mahisha Country, *Journ. Num. Soc. Ind.*, Vol. XXVI, 1950, pp. 50-52.
28. City of Udabhāṇḍa, *Siddha Bhāratī*, Hoshyarpur, 1950, pp. 291-94.
29. Text of the Purāṇic List of Rivers, *Ind. Hist. Quart.* XXVII, 1951, pp. 215-38.
30. The Name of Dacca, *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. XI, 1950, pp. 183-86.
31. Ancient Indian Cartography, *Indian Archives*, Vol. V, 1951, pp. 60-63.
32. Gauḍa, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVIII, June 1952, pp. 123ff.
33. Prācīn Uḍishyā, *Itihās* (Bengali), Vol. IV, B.S. 1360, pp. 150-57.
34. Saknāt-Sankāt-Sanknāt of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XIX, 1953, pp. 33-36.
35. The Chakravartin and his Kshetra, *Sarūpa-Bhāratī* (Dr. Lakshman Sarup Mem. Vol. Hoshyarpur, 1954, pp. 315-25).
36. Supplementary Note on the Barli Inscription, *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XL, Part I, 1954, pp. 8-16.
37. Gayā Tīrtha, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XXXII, December, 1954, pp. 283-89.
38. Ancient Orissa, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. IV, 1955-56, pp. 51-57.
39. Le Nom de la Māna-bhūmi et du Māna-deśa, *Actes du Congrès International Oriental*, Vol. XXI, Paris, 1948, pp. 199-201.

40. Capital of the Later Aulikaras, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXV, No. 1, March 1959, pp. 73-75.
41. Kāndhārapura, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XXXVII, Part III, December 1959, pp. 407-09.
42. Sulaiman's Ruhmī, *Ind. Stud. Past. & Pres.*, Vol. III, No. 3, April-June 1962, pp. 355-59.
43. The City of Krimilā, *Bīār. Vid.*, Vols. XX-XXI (K. M. Munshi Vol.), 1963, pp. 274-77.
44. The Land of the Kambojas, *Purāṇa*, Vol. V, No. 2, July 1963, pp. 251-57.
45. Mahi-sāgara-saṅgama, *ibid.*, pp. 352-54.
46. Extent of Prāgyotisha, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLI (Silver Jub. Vol.), 1963, pp. 363-69.
47. Kamboja, *Purāṇa*, Vol. VI, No. 1, January 1964, pp. 215-20.
48. Orissa and Uḍḍiyāna, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, June 1964, pp. 329-31.
49. Kāṅkandinagari, *Āchārya Bhikshu Smṛitigrantha*, Calcutta, 1961, pp. 27-28.
50. Malwa as the Name of the Ujjayini Region, *Bhār. Vid.* Vol. XXV, 1967, pp. 1-5.
51. A'sānda and Varvara, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLIII, Part II, August 1965, pp. 343-48.
52. Ariaka, *ibid.*, Part III, December 1965, pp. 693-98.
53. The Capital of Samatata, *Ind. Mus. Bull.*, Vol. II, No. 1, January 1967, pp. 7-9.
54. Identical Names of Different Localities, *Reunion Souvenir*, AIHC, CU., 1967, pp. 1-2.
55. Chaturdvīpā and Saptadvīpā Vasumatī, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLVI, Part I, April 1968, pp. 19-26.
56. Capital of the Śākya, *Cal. Rev.*, Vol. I, No. 1, July-September 1969, pp. 69-70.
57. The Elephant-forests of Ancient India, *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography*, edited by Sircar, Calcutta, 1970, pp. 160-72.
58. Indian Influence on the Geographical Names of South-East Asia *Vivekananda Com. Vol.*, edited by Lokesh Chandra and others, Madras, pp. 41-46.
59. Kamboj-deśer Avasthān, *Viśva-Bhāratī Patrikā* (Bengali), Vol. XX, B.S. 1370, pp. 13-16.
60. Prāgyotish O Kāmrūp Rājya, *Pravāsī* (Bengali), Vol. XLIII, Part II, B.S. 1370, Agraḥayan, pp. 281-83.
61. Andhra-deś, *Bhāratkosh* (Bengali), Vol. I, pp. 61-63.
62. Avanti, *ibid.*, pp. 84-85.
63. Āryāvarta, *ibid.*, p. 362.
64. Mālav Jātir Deś, *Chaturāṅga* (Bengali), Vol. XXVI, B.S. 1371, pp. 215-18.
65. Oḍiśā, *Bhāratkosh* (Bengali), Vol. II, 1966, pp. 93-95.
66. Kurukshetra, *ibid.*, pp. 366-68.
67. Kuśasthālī, *ibid.*, p. 374.
68. Kuśāvartī, *ibid.*, pp. 374-75.
69. Pañcāl Deś, *Itihās*, N.S., Vol. I, B.S. 1373, pp. 235-38.
70. Gauḍ, *Bhāratkosh*, Vol. III, pp. 217-18.
71. Chandradvīp, *ibid.*, pp. 286-87.
72. Jambudvīp, *ibid.*, pp. 728-29.
73. Drishadavartī, *ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 79.

VI. SANSKRIT LITERATURE AND ALLIED SUBJECTS

1. Kāvya Style in the Inscriptions of the Successors of the Śātavāhanas, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IV, October 1937, pp. 240-47.
2. Unhistoricity of the Kaumudīmahotsava, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XI, 1937, pp. 61-67.
3. The Trivandrum Plays and the Mṛichhakatika, *The Scholar Annual*, Palghat, 1938, pp. 41ff.
4. Inscriptional Evidences regarding the Development of Classical Sanskrit, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XV, 1939, pp. 38ff. See *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Allahabad, 1938, pp. 91-96.
5. Date of Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XII, October 1938, p. 108.
6. The Chhandahsūtra of Piṅgala, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VI, July 1939, pp. 110ff.
7. Date of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XV, December 1939, pp. 633ff.
8. An Apocryphal Section in Piṅgala's Chhandahsūtra, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VI, October 1939, p. 247.
9. The Chhandamakhānta of Puruṣottamabhaṭṭa, *ibid.*, April 1940, pp. 471-78. Cf. *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Calcutta, 1939, pp. 818-22.
10. The Sixth and Seventh Syllables of an Anuṣṭubh Quarter, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XX, March 1944, pp. 82-83.
11. Samudragupta O Kṛishṇacharita, *Pravāsī* (Bengali), B.S. 1350, Pausa, p. 303.

12. Śābdik Purushottam, *ibid.*, Phālgun, B.S. 1351, pp. 251-53.
13. Tantrīchārya Kṛishṇānanda Āgamavṅgīś, *ibid.*, Śrāvaṇ, B.S. 1354, pp. 582-85. Cf. *Agrahāyan*, pp. 204-06; *Māgh*, pp. 411-12.
14. Date of Abhinanda author of the Rāmcharita, *Ind. Hist. Quart.* Vol. XXV, No. 2, June 1949, pp. 132-34.
15. The word *saikara*, *Journ. Kal. Hist. Res. Sec.* Vol. II-III, 1930, pp. 229-30.
16. Date of the Vaidhyahṛidayānanda by Yogi Prabhārjya, *An. Bhand, Or. Res. Inst.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 218-21.
17. Bālavalabhībhujaṅga, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 80-82.
18. Kavi Kalhaṇ O tat-kṛita Rājataranginī, *Itihās*, Vol. 1, B.S. 1957, pp. 152-60.
19. Purushottam the Lexicographer, *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1952, pp. 167-70.
20. Poet Chhittapa, *Indo-As. Cult.*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1954, pp. 259-64. See *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Waltair, 193, pp. 124-28.
21. Mahākavichakravartī Chhittapa, *Pravāsī*, Bhādra, B.S. 1360, pp. 619-21.
22. Māgarāja author of the Māgarājapaddhati, *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XLV, 1959, pp. 29-30.
23. A Manuscript of Jivadeva's Bhaktibhāgavata, *Ind. Stud. Past & Pres.*, Vol. 1V, No. 1, 1962, pp. 105-10.
24. The Mādala Pāñjī and Jivadeva's Bhakribhāgavata, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. 1V, 1962, pp. 9-16.
25. The Sayings of Dāk, *Prāgyotisha*, Gauhati, 1965, pp. 24-28.
26. Story of the Posthumous Son, *Folklore*, Vol. VI, No. 1, January, 1965, pp. 5-6.
27. Son of Human Mother and Divine Father, *ibid.*, No. 2, February, 1965, pp. 57-58.
28. The Milk-Producing Cow, *ibid.*, Vol. VI, No. 5, May, 1965, pp. 203-09.
29. Documents of Rāñī Bhavānī of Nātor, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. IV, 1962, pp. 141-50.
30. Beef in Hindu Folklore of Bengal, *Folklore*, Vol. VI, July, 1965, pp. 294-95.
31. Some Sanskrit Words indicating Territorial Units, *N.K. Bhattasali Vol.*, Dacca, 1966, pp. 8-11.
32. Śīlālipir Kāvyotkarsha, *Betār Jagat* (Bengali), August 1963, pp. 655.
33. Dāker Vachan, *Viśva-Bhāratī Patrikā*, Vol. XXI, B.S. 1371, pp. 241-45.

VII. RELIGIOUS LIFE AND ALLIED SUBJECTS

1. Samudragupta's Aśvamedha Sacrifice, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XIII, April, 1934, pp. 35ff.
2. Hiranyagarbha, *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, London, October 1934, pp. 729-32.
3. Aśvamedha, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. I, October 1934, pp. 311ff.
4. Viṣṇu, *Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc.*, Bangalore, Vol. XXV, April 1935, pp. 299-301.
5. Importance of the Aśvamedha, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. II, April 1936, pp. 789-93.
6. Two Verses and their bearing on the Horse Sacrifice, *ibid.*, Vol. IV, October 1937, pp. 272-73.
7. Vāmadeva the Śaiva Saint, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XLV, March 1938, pp. 96-100.
8. Viśveśvara a Bengali Śaiva Saint of the Thirteenth Century, *Cal. Rev.*, June 1938, pp. 323-26.
9. Guptapūjā and the Chhāndogya Upanishad, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. X, 1937-38, pp. 228-29.
10. The Sword of the Sikhs, *Maharajah Ranjit Singh Centenary Volume*, Cawnpore, 1940, pp. 101-103.
11. Goddess Aparṇā, *Journ. Kal. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. I, 1946, pp. 87-88.
12. Sectarian Difference among the Early Vaishnavas, *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. VII, 1947, pp. 109-11.
13. Gaṅga Bhānudeva II and Purushottama Jagannātha, *Journ. Kal. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. I, 1946, pp. 251-53.
14. Śiva and Śakti in the Orthodox Indian Pantheon, *The Advance*, Annual Number, 1949, pp. 1-2.
15. Tāntrik Gupta-pūjā O Chhāndogya Upanishad, *Kāyastha Patrikā* (Bengali), Phalgun, B.S. 1342, pp. 356-57.
16. Rājārshi Aśoker Dharma O Mauryayuger Sāmpradayik Samasyā, *Dhākābandhav* (Bengali), Calcutta Vol. I, B.S. 1347, pp. 60-64.
17. Bāṅgālī Śaiva Sādhu Viśveśvarasambhu, *Srībhārati* (Bengali), Bhādra, B.S. 1348, pp. 48-51.
18. Chīndese Baudha Dharmer Praveś, *Udbodhan* (Bengali), B.S. 1348, pp. 491-93.
19. Tibbater Bauddha Samskṛiti, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Paus, B.S. 1350, pp. 61-64; *ibid.*, Māgh, pp. 86-88.

20. Ekāṇṇa Piṭher Utpatti, *ibid.*, Paush, B.S. 1352, pp. 1-4.
21. Yoni Piṭher Kathā, *ibid.*, Agrahāyan, B.S. 1353, pp. 503-06.
22. Purushottam Jagannāth, *ibid.*, Vaiśākḥ, B.S. 1354, pp. 432-33.
23. Devī Aparāṇā, *Ushā* (Bengali), Śrādiyā, B.S. 1353, pp. 7-8.
24. Hiranyagarbha, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Bhādra, B.S. 1340, pp. 393ff.
25. Bhārate Śakti-pujā, *Kalyāṇasī* (Bengali), Āsvina, B.S. 1355, pp. 278-80.
26. Prāchīn Vaṅge Dharmapūja, *Pravāsi*, Āshādh, B.S. 1356, pp. 260-61 ; *ibid.*, Paush, pp. 274-75.
27. Chākmā Jātir Dharma-kām, *ibid.*, Āsvina, pp. 520-24.
28. Śrādiyā Durgotsaver Prāchīnatā, *Kalyāṇasī*, Āsvina, B.S. 1356, pp. 1ff.
29. Purī aur Katakame Bhagavān Purushottam, *Itihās* (Hindi), Delhi, Jyeshṭh, Sarāvat 1007, pp. 57-60.
30. Dharma Thākur, *Dainik Vasumati* (Bengali), October 29, 1950.
31. God Purushottama at Purī and Cuttack, *Journ. Or. Res.*, Vol. XVII, 1950, pp. 209-15.
32. Vaishnavism in the Early Period, Chapter XIX of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. II—*The Age of Imperial Unity*, edited by R.C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1951, pp. 431ff.
33. Eḍūka, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXIX, 1953, pp. 302-03.
34. The Vijayārājya of a Saint. *Or. Hist. Res. Journ.*, Vol. I, 1952, pp. 48-51.
35. Bhagavān Purushottam Jagannāth, *Itihās* (Bengali), Vol. IV, B.S. 1360, pp. 8-14.
36. Decline of Buddhism in Bengal. *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. XIII, pp. 55-61.
37. The Temple of Purī, *Indo-As. Cult.*, Vol. II, 1953, pp. 120-26.
38. Vaishnavism in the Gupta Age, Chapter XVIII of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. III—*The Classical Age*, edited by R.C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1954, pp. 414-23.
39. Suicide in Ancient and Medieval India, *Calcutta Police Journal*, Vol. III, January-June, 1955, pp. 7-12.
40. Vaishnavism in the Post-Gupta Age, Section D of Chapter XII of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. IV—*The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, edited by R.C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1955, pp. 310-12.
41. Early History of Vaishnavism, *Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. IV, Calcutta, 1956, pp. 108-45.
42. Vaishnavism, Section in Chapter XVI of *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. V—*The Struggle for Empire*, edited by R.C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1957, pp. 435-42.
43. Some Performers of Āśvamedha, *Sundaram Pillai Com. Vol.*, Madras, 1957, pp. 93-97.
44. Paramadaivata, *Ind. Stud. Past & Pres.*, Vol V, No. 1, October-December 1963, pp. 89-92.
45. Pañchāṅgula, *Ahmedānanda Ac. An.*, Vol. IV, 1964, pp. 15-16.
46. The Udayana-vihāra, *Mahavir Jayanti Souvenir*, 1965, p. 25.
47. The Narasimha Cult, *Saṅkari Mookerjee Fel. Vol.*, Varanasi, 1969, pp. 42-44.
48. The Śakti Cult in Western India, *The Śakti Cult and Tārā*, edited by Sircar, Calcutta, 1967, pp. 87-91.
49. Tārā of Chandradvīpa, *ibid.*, pp. 128-33.
50. Purushottama-Jagannātha, *Ind. Stud. Past & Pres.*, Vol. VIII, 1967, pp. 269-74.
51. Antiquity of the Bhakti Cult, *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography*, edited by Sircar, Calcutta, 1970, pp. 36-41.
52. Guardians of the Quarters, *Religious Life in Ancient India*, edited by Sircar, Calcutta, 1972, pp. 72-80.
53. Pañchāṅgula, *Anandam* (Bengali), B.S. 1371, pp. 17-19.
54. Virer Svargalābh, *Kalyāṇī* (Bengali), B.S. 1372, pp. 7-11.
55. Tīrthasthān. *Bhāratkosh* (Bengali), Vol. III, pp. 728-29.
56. Durgā Mahishamardini. *Betār Jagat* (Bengali), B.S. 1376, pp. 10ff.
57. Devadāsī, *Bhāratkosh* (Bengali), Vol. IV, pp. 87-88.
58. Pīṭhasthān, *ibid.*, pp. 390-91.

VIII. POLITY, ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC LIFE

1. The Divyas, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. VII, April 1933, pp. 105ff.
2. Panaprathā O Ekakḥāni Tamil Silālpī, *Pravāsi* (Bengali), Āsvina, B.S. 1340, pp. 810ff.
3. Yavana and Pārasīka, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XIV, April 1935, pp. 34-38.
4. Belief in Water Sprit, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IV, January 1938, p. 354f.

5. A Bengali Custom, *ibid.*, Vol. V, 1939, pp. 154ff.
6. The Andhras and their Position in Brahmanical Society, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVI, September, 1940, pp. 560-66.
7. King Aśoka and the Solution of the Communal Problem in Maurya India, *The Scholar Annual*, Palghat, 1940, pp. 65-67.
8. A Note on the Private Ownership of Soil, *Hind. Her.*, Bombay, April 1941, pp. 51-52.
9. Glimpses into Domestic and Social Life from a Story in the Daśakumāracharita, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XX, April 1941, pp. 105-10.
10. The Chain of Justice, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. VII, January 1941, pp. 364-65.
11. Eunuchs as Guards of a Royal Harem, *Gopalakrishnamacharya, Vol.*, Madras, pp. 438-40.
12. Nivartana and Gocharma, *Erāchyavāṇī*, Calcutta, Vol. I, January 1944, pp. 27-29.
13. The Ambashṭha Jāti, *Journ. U.P. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 148-61.
14. Gotrāntara or the Change of a Woman's Gotra, *Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, Annamalainagar, 1945, pp. 48-52.
15. Kulyavāpa, Droṇavāpa and Ādhavapa, *Bhārata Kaumudī*, Allahabad, Part II, pp. 943-48.
16. Further Notes on the Vākāṭakas, *Journ. R. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XIII, 1947, pp. 75-78.
17. Origin of the Kadambas, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. IV, July 1937, pp. 118-23.
18. Stryadhyaśha Mahāmātra, *Śrībhāratī* (Bengali), Calcutta, Chaitra, B. S. 1347, pp. 499-501.
19. Prāchīn Gauḍavāsīr Samudra-yātrī, *Udbodhan* (Bengali) Śrāvaṇ, B. S. 1348, pp. 346-49.
20. Kulyavāper Bhūmi-parimāṇ, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Bhādra, B. S. 1349, pp. 263-65.
21. Kulyavāp evaṁ Kulavāy, *ibid.*, Paus, pp. 38-39.
22. Prāchīn Bhārata Avarodh-prathā, *Saṁhati* (Bengali), Calcutta, Phālgun, B. S. 1349, pp. 609-11.
23. Vivartan O Gocharmer Bhūmi-parimāṇ, *Pravāsī* (Bengali), Kārttik, B. S. 1350.
24. Nivartan evaṁ Gocharma, *ibid.*, Paus, B. S. 1350, pp. 303-04; cf *ibid.*, Māgh, B. S. 1350, p. 435.
25. Nāīr Gotrāntar, *ibid.*, Phālgun, pp. 133ff.
26. Sudūr Dakṣiṇ Bhārter Ambashṭha Jāti, *ibid.*, Ashāḍh, B. S. 1351, pp. 206ff.
27. Mrityu-vṛitti, *Saṁhati* (Bengali), Vaiśākh, B. S. 1351, pp. 9-11.
28. Prāchīn Kāśmīre Durbhiksha, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Āśvin, B. S. 1351, pp. 241-45.
29. Prāchīn Bhārater Kayekaṭi Mckaddamā, *Pravāsī* (Bengali), Kārttik, B. S. 1351, pp. 25-29.
30. Ektī Prāchīn Kathā-chitra, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Phālgun, B. S. 1351, p. 97-100.
31. Vaiśālīke Lichchhavi, *Vaiśālī* (Hindi), Muzaffarpur, 1945, pp. 13ff.
32. Rājyaśrīr Vivāha, *Pravāsī* (Bengali), Vaiśākh, B. S. 1952, pp. 45-50.
33. Kayastha Śabder Vyutpatti, *Hindusthān* (Bengali), October 26, 1946, pp. 6-7.
34. Vichārter Ghaṇṭā, *Bhāratavarsha* (Bengali), Śrāvaṇ, B. S. 1354, pp. 112-13.
35. Prāchīn Uḍishyāy Śtrī-rāja, *ibid.*, Chaitra, B. S. 1355, pp. 265-67.
36. A List of Customary Laws in a Record of the Sixth Century, *Journ. R. As. Soc. Beng.* Letters, Vol. XVI, 1950; pp. 113-21.
37. Kāyastha, *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. X, 1949, pp. 230-84.
38. About Theft in Ancient India, *Cal. Pol. Journ.*, Vol. I, No. 1, January-March, 1953, pp. 6-18.
39. The Astrologer at the Village and the Court, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXVIII, 1952, pp. 342-49.
40. Spread of Aryanism in Bengal, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Letters, Vol. XVII, 1951, pp. 171-78.
41. Great Women of North India (c. 400 B.C. to 1200 A.D.), Chapter IV of *Great Women of India*, Almora, 1953 : see *Bhār. Vid.*, Vol. XV, 1954, pp. 5-27.
42. Nagaraśreṣṭhīn, *Journ. Univ. Gauhati*, Vol. VI, 1955, pp. 81-85.
43. Dravidian Problem, *Man in India*, Vol. XXXV, January-March 1955, pp. 31-38.
44. The Karnāṭas outside Karnāṭa, *J. N. Banerjee Vol.*, 1960, pp. 211-19.
45. Brahmakshatriya, *Vishveshvarananda Indol. Journ.* Vol. I, No. 1, March 1963, pp. 87-90.
46. Brahmakshatriya and Brahmapaiśya, *ibid.*, No. 2, p. 1-2.
47. Sagara's Adversaries, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. IV, 1962, pp. 49-54.
48. The Guhila Claim of Solar Origin, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLII, Part II, August 1964, pp. 381-87.
49. Avaktavya-nāma : Avoidance of Names, *Man in India*, Vol. 46, No. 1, March 1966, pp. 74-80.
50. Kapola-ṛāṭana *Satābdakaurnud*, Nagpur Museum, 1969, p. 131.
51. The Robbers of the Forest, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XV, 1966, pp. 378-80.

XXII

15. Date of the Periplus, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXIX, 1963, pp. 138-42; *Journ. Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. XLIX, 1963, pp. 28-33.
16. Early Western Satraps and the Date of the Periplus, *Num. Chron.*, Vol. VI, 1966, pp. 243-49.
17. Foreword to A. N. Lahiri's Index of *Epigraphia Indica*, Vols. I-XXXIV, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXIV, Part VI, p. i-vi.
18. Deterioration in Indian Historical Scholarship, *Quart. Rev. Hist. Stud.*, Vol. III, 1963-64, pp. 20-23.
19. Archaeological Evidence for the Reconstruction of Early Indian History, *Ind. Mus. Bull.*, No. 1 January 1966, pp. 10-16.
20. J. N. Banerjee, 1835-1966, *Year Book of the As. Soc. for 1966*, Vol. IX, 1967, pp. 128-31.
21. Foreword to *The Hūnas in India*, by Dr. U. Thakur, Varanasi, 1967.
22. Reminiscences, *Prāchyavidyā-taraṅgiṇi*, Calcutta University, 1969, pp. 363-69.
23. Foreword to *The Economic History of the Deccan*, by Dr. D. R. Da., Delhi, 1969, pp. v-vi.
24. Foreword to *Aśoka* (4th print) by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Calcutta University, 1969, pp. xxv-xxx.
25. B. C. Law, 1891-1969, *Vishvesharanand Indol. Journ.*, Vol. VII, 1969, pp. 160-64. See *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. III, 1969-70, pp. 347-49.
26. Foreword to the *Political History of Ancient India* (7th ed.) by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, 1972, pp. vii-xii.
27. Editorial Note on Dr. Buddha Prakash's paper, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. IV, 1970-71 pp. 151-52.
28. Source book : General Difficulties, *Indian Civilization : The First Phase*, edited by Malik, Simla, 1971, pp. 31-33.
29. Editorial Note on Dr. P. K. Bhattacharya's Paper, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. V, 1971-72, p. 225.
30. Indological Studies in India and Pakistan (address of the General President at the 26th Session of the All-India Oriental Conference at Ujjain, 1972), *Cal. Rev.*, N. S., Vol. II, 1971, pp. 307-19.
31. The Number of Ratnas, *S. K. De Mem. Vol.*, edited by Hazra and Banerjee, Calcutta, 1972, pp. 75-81.
32. Foreword to *Geography in Ancient Indian Inscriptions (upto 650 A.D.)* by Dr. P. Gupta, D. K. Publishing House, Delhi, 1973.
33. Kuru, *Bhāratkosh* (Bengali), Vol. II, 1966, pp. 364-66.
34. Kuru-Pāñchāl, *ibid.*, p. 368.
35. Navaratna, *Betār Jagat*, (Bengali), B. S. 1371, pp. 27-28.
36. Gargayana and Kālayavana, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. III, 1969-70, pp. 141-44.
37. Hirashi's Numismatic Notes, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. IV 1970-71, pp. 195-200.

XI. REVIEWS

1. *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, by Dr. H.C. Ray, *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. I, April 1935, pp. 718-19.
2. *The Successors of Sher Shah* by N.B. Roy, *ibid.*, Vol. II, April 1936, p. 827.
3. *Elements of Buddhist Iconography* by Dr. A. Coomaraswamy, *ibid.*, p. 831.
4. *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vols. I and II, by Dr. H.C. Ray, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, August 1936, pp. 269-71.
5. *Hindu Civilization* by Dr. R.K. Mookerjee, *Ind. Cult.*, April 1937, p. 766.
6. *Suvarṇadvīpa* by Dr. R.C. Majumdar, *ibid.*, Vol. IV, October 1937, p. 278.
7. *Geographical Essays*, Part I, by Dr. B.C. Law, *ibid.*, pp. 277-78.
8. *Studies in Chinese Art and Some Indian Influences*, *ibid.*, Vol. V, July 1938, pp. 122-23.
9. *Gautama Buddha* (Bengali) by Dr. B.C. Law, *ibid.*, October, 1938, p. 221.
10. *History of Pre-Musalmān India*, Vol. II: *Vedic India*, Part I—*The Aryan Expansion over India*, by V. Rangacharya, *ibid.*, pp. 221-22.
11. *The Indian Empire* edited by Prof. C.S. Srinivasachari, *ibid.*, January 1939, p. 345.
12. *Humāyun Badshāh* by Dr. S.K. Banerjee, *ibid.*, p. 351.
13. *Harshavardhana* (Hindi) by G.S. Chatterjee, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XV, June 1939, pp. 327-29.
14. *Meghadūta (Le Nouage Messenger)* by M. Assier de Pompignam, *ibid.*, December 1939, pp. 645-46.
15. *Die Yajus des Asvamedha* by Dr. Srikrishna Bhawe, *ibid.*, September 1939, pp. 490-91.

16. *History of the City of Madras* by Prof. C.S. Srinivasachari, *ibid.*, Vol. VI, July 1939, pp. 121f.
17. *Kauśāmbī in Ancient Literature*, by Dr. B.C. Law, *Journ. Andh. Hist. Res. Soc.*, Rajahmundry, Vol. XIII, January, 1939, p. 188.
18. *Alivardi and his Times* by Dr. K.K. Datta, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XVI, March 1940, pp. 193-95.
19. *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, Vol. II— *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Parts I and II, by Dr. R.C. Majumdar, *ibid.*, pp. 195-97.
20. *The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization* by Dr. A.S. Altekar, *Science and Culture*, September 1940, pp. 183-84.
21. *The Santal Insurrection of 1853-57* by Dr. K.K. Datta, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, December 1940, p. 856.
22. *History of Tirupati* by Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, *ibid.*, pp. 857ff.
23. *Sources of Kārnāṭaka History*, Vol. I. Srikantha Sastri, *ibid.*, Vol. XVII, March 1941, pp. 133-34.
24. *Nandapura—A Forsaken Kingdom*, Part I, by Kumar Vidyadhar Singh Rao, *Cal. Rev.*, April 1941, pp. 84-85.
25. *Burhan's Tuzuk-i-Walajahi* by Dr. S.M. Husayn Nainar, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, June 1941, p. 274.
26. *The Zamorins of Calicut* by K.V. Krishna Ayyar, *ibid.*, pp. 274-75.
27. *Administration and Social Life under Vijayanagara* by Dr. T.V. Mahalingam, *ibid.*, pp. 275-76.
28. *The Rāmācharita of Sandhyākaranandin* edited by Dr. R.C. Majumdar and others, *ibid.*, pp. 276-78.
29. *The Prithivīrājaviṣṭaka of Jayānaba* edited by G.H. Ojha and G.S. Guleri, *ibid.*, Vol. XVIII, March 1942, pp. 78-91.
30. *Translation of the Kharashthī Documents from Central Asia* by T. Burrow, *ibid.*, September 1942, p. 287.
31. *History of Ancient India* by Dr. R.S. Tripathi, *ibid.*, December 1942, pp. 383-84.
32. *Keśavabhaṭṭa's Dāṇḍanūti-prakaraṇa*, *ibid.*, Vol. XIX, June, 1943 pp. 193-95.
33. *Nālandā and its Epigraphic Material* by Dr. H. Sastri, *ibid.*, September 1943, pp. 286-88.
34. *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, edited by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, *Journ. R. As. Soc., Beng.* Letters, Calcutta, Vol. IX, 1943, pp. 230-33.
35. *Ancient Viṣṇuṭī-patras* by Dr. H. Sastri, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XX, March 1944, pp. 90-91.
36. *Topographical List of Travancore Inscriptions* by R. V. Poduval, *ibid.*, 91-92.
37. *Important Inscriptions from the Baroda State* edited by A. S. Gadre, *ibid.*, September 1944, pp. 296-97.
38. *Do*, Vol. II, edited by Yazdani and Gyani, *ibid.*, Vol. XXI, March 1945, pp. 65-66.
39. *Hindu Colonies in the Far East* by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, *Nationalist*, Calcutta, Sunday, July. 29, 1945.
40. *War in Ancient India* by V. R. R. Dikshitar, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 237-38.
41. *The Nāyakas of Tanjore* by V. Vriddhagirisan, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXII, September 1946 pp. 240.
42. *Shivaji* by S. R. Sharma, and *The Bahmani Kingdom* by H. K. Sherwani, *ibid.*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 74-75.
43. *The Annual Report of the Mysore Archaeological Department*, *ibid.*, December 1947, pp. 341-43.
44. *An Introduction to the Study of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma* by Dr. N. Ray, *ibid.*, Vol. XXIV pp. 162-65.
45. *Anthologie Sanskrite (Textes de l'Inde Ancienne Traduits du Sanskrit)* by Dr. Louis Renou, *ibid.*, pp. 165-66.
46. *The History of the Early Dynasties of Andhradeśa* by B. V. Krishna Rao, *Journ. R. As. Soc. Beng.*, Letters, Vol. XIV, 1948, pp. 148-49.
47. *Epigraphical Echoes of Kālidāsa* by C. Sivaramamurti, *ibid.*, pp. 152-53.
48. *Inscriptions of Kambuja* edited by R. C. Majumdar, *Indo-As. Cult.* Vol. III, No. 1, July 1954, pp. 96-97.
49. *The Bibliography of Madhya Bhārata Archaeology*, Part I, by Dr. H. V. Trivedi, *Bhar. Vid.*, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1954, pp. 91-92.
50. *Simhaleśa Śilpa O Sabhyatā* by M. B. Gupta, *Itihās* (Bengali), Vol. IV, No. 4, B. S. 1360-61, pp. 273-75.
51. *Gupta Rāj-vaṃśer Svārṇa-mudrā* (review of *Catalogue of Gupta Coins in the Bayana Hoard* by Dr. A. S. Altekar), *ibid.*, Vol. V, No. 3, B. S. 1361-62, pp. 198-202.

52. *Prāchīn Bhārater Janapad* (review of *Ethnic Elements in Ancient India* by Dr. S.B. Chaudhuri), *ibid.*, Vol. VI, No. 2, B. S. 1362-63.
53. *Aśoka's Edicts* by A. C. Sen, *Indo-As. Cult.*, Vol. V, No. 3, January 1957, pp. 347-48.
54. *Ethnic Elements in Ancient India*, Part I, by Dr. S. B. Chaudhuri, *Journ. As. Soc.* Vol. XXII, No. 2, 1956, pp. 266-68.
55. *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas* by Dr. A.D. Pusalker *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, Vol. XXXVII, 1957, pp. 348-50.
56. *Economic Life of Northern India in the Gupta Period* (c. A.D. 300-550.) by Dr. S. K. Maity, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. XXXIII, 1957, pp. 254-57.
57. *Catalogue of the Coins of the Nāga Kings of Padmāvati* by Dr. H.V. Trivedi, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV, 1958, pp. 292-94.
58. *Aśokan Inscriptions* edited by Dr. R. G. Basak, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XXXVII, Part I, April 1959, pp. 115-17.
59. *The Early Rulers of Khajuraho* by Dr. S.K. Mitra, *ibid.*, Part III, December, 1959, pp. 429-30.
60. *Chronology of Gujarat—Historical and Cultural* by Dr. M.R. Majumdar, *ibid.*, Vol. XXXVIII, Part III, December 1960, pp. 681-82.
61. *Akota Bronzes* by Dr. U. P. Shah' *ibid.*, Vol. XXXIX, Part I, April 1961, pp. 183-85.
62. *Indian History—A Study in Dynamics* by U. A. Raiker *ibid.*, pp. 185-87.
63. *Report on Kumrahar Excavations, 1951-55*, by Dr. A. S. Altekar and V. K. Mishra, *ibid.*, pp. 187-89.
64. *The Decline of Buddhism in India* by R. C. Mitra, *ibid.*, part II, August 1961, pp. 348-49.
65. *Chronology of the Bhauma-Karas and the Somavāmśis of Orissa* by Dr. K. C. Panigrahi, *ibid.*, Vol. XL, Part I, April 1962, pp. 208-10.
66. *The Harappa Culture and the West* by Dr. Mode, *ibid.*, pp. 210-12.
67. *Murshid Quli Khan and his Times* by Dr. A. Karim, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, June 1964 pp. 410-11.
68. *The Historical Geography and Topography of Bihar* by Dr. M. S. Pandey. *Journ. Ind. Hist.* Vol. XLII, Part II, August 1964, pp. 570-71.
69. *History of Kosala upto the Rise of the Mauryas* by Dr. V. Pathak, *ibid.*, pp. 572-74.
70. *An Early History of Orissa* by Dr. A.C. Mittal, *ibid.*, pp. 574-76.
71. *Sources of Indian History* by K. A. Nilkanta Sastri, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XIV, No. 2, December 1964, pp. 203-04.
72. *Political and Social Movements in Ancient Punjab* by Dr. Buddha Prakash, *ibid.*, pp. 204-06.
73. *Sagor through the Ages* by Prof. K. D. Bajpai, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLII, Part II, December 1964, Vol. XLII, pp. 965-66.
74. *Prehistory and Protohistory of India and Pakistan* by Dr. H.D. Sankalia, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. V, Nos. 3-4, 1967, pp. 24-26.
75. *Art and Architecture of the Gampola Period* by N. Mudiyanse, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLIII, Part III, December 1965, p. 642.
76. *Early Chālukya Temples of Āndhra Deśa* by Dr. M. Rama Rao, *ibid.*, p. 943.
77. *Indian Palaeography* by Dr. A. H. Dani, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1964, pp. 46-47.
78. *Corpus of Indo-Greek Coins* by Dr. A. N. Lahiri, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLIV, Part I, April 1966, pp. 302-03.
79. *A Guide to Field Study* edited by S. Sengupta, *Mod. Rev.*, October, 1966, p. 311.
80. *A History of South India* by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLIV, Part II, August 1966, pp. 618-20.
81. *Ancient Historian of India—A Study in Historical Biographies* by Dr. V. S. Pathak, *ibid.*, pp. 620-21.
82. *Excavations at Devnimori* by Drs. R. N. Mehta and S. N. Chowdhary, *ibid.*, pp. 621-23.
83. *Social Ideas and Social changes in Bengal 1818-1835* by Dr. A. F. Sahabuddin Ahmed, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XVI, No. 1, September 1966, pp. 98-99.
84. *Ancient Historians of India* by Dr. V. S. Pathak, *ibid.*, pp. 99-101.
85. *A Comparative Study of a Bengal Folktale* by Dr. Ralph Troger, translated by Dr. H. Mode, *Folklore*, Volume VIII, No. 3, March 1967, pp. 111-12.
86. *500 Questions on the Subjects requiring Investigation in the Social Condition of the People of India* by J. Lerg, edited by Dr. M. P. Saha, *ibid.*, pp. 112-13.

87. *Light on Early Indian Society and Economy* by Prof. R. S. Sharma, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLIV Part III, December 1966, pp. 891-92.
88. *Early Chola Art* by S. R. Balasubrahmanyam, *ibid.*, pp. 906-07.
89. *India under the Kushānas* by Dr. B. N. Puri, *ibid.*, pp. 910-11.
90. *Early Indian Economics: Studies in the Economic Life of Northern and Western India* by Dr. G. L. Adhya, *ibid.*, pp. 921-22.
91. *Bibliography of Medieval Rajasthan (Social and Cultural)* by Dr. G. N. Sharma, *ibid.*, pp. 927-28.
92. *Utkal University History of Orissa*, Vol. 1, edited by Dr. N. K. Sahu, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, 1965, pp. 110-11.
93. *Kerala Megaliths and their Builders* by L. A. Krishna Iyer, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLV, Part I, April 1967, pp. 267-68.
94. *Pre-Literate Man* by P. Gilbert, *ibid.*, p. 293.
95. *A Dictionary of Indian History* by S. Bhattacharya, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XVII, No. 1, September 1907, pp. 108-09.
96. *Studies in Indology*, Vol. IV, by Dr. V. V. Mirashi, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLV, Part II, August, 1967, pp. 629-30.
97. *Copper-plates of Sylhet, Vol. I 17th-11th Century* by K. K. Gupta, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XVII, No. 3, March 1968, pp. 335-36.
98. *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry* translated by Daniel H. H. Ingalls, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. I (1967-68), pp. 216-19.
99. *The Geographical Encyclopaedia of Ancient and Medieval India*, Part I, edited by Prof. K. D. Bajpai and others, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLVI, Part I, April 1968, pp. 166-69.
100. *The Chronicle of Buddhism in China, 581-960 A.D.* by Jan Yun-Hua, *ibid.*, Vol. XLV, Part II, August, 1967, pp. 630-31.
101. *Indian Numerals* by Dr. Sm. S. L. Gokhale, *ibid.*, pp. 631-32.
102. *Social and Rural Economy of Northern India*, Vol. II—*Trade and Commerce*, 2nd ed., by Dr. A. N. Bose, *ibid.*, Part. III, December 1967, pp. 820-21.
103. *The Origin and Development of Vaishnavism* by Dr. Sm. S. Jaiswal, *ibid.*, pp. 824-25.
104. *Social Life in Northern India (A. D. 600-1000)* by Dr. B. N. Sharma, *ibid.*, pp. 826-27.
105. *Śaṅkaradeva and His Times* (Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Assam) by Prof. M. Neog, *ibid.*, pp. 832-33.
106. *Coins of the Pāṇdyas* by C. H. Biddulph, *ibid.*, pp. 834-35.
107. *Early Medieval Coin Types of Northern India* by Dr. L. Gopal, *ibid.*, pp. 839-40.
108. *American Missionaries and Hinduism* by Dr. S. M. Pathak, *ibid.*, pp. 841-43.
109. *Some Aspects of the History of Hinduism* by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, *ibid.*, pp. 844-46.
110. *A Survey of Folklore Study in Bengal (West Bengal and East Pakistan)* by S. Sengupta, *ibid.*, p. 849.
111. *A Short History of Pakistan* by Dr. A. H. Dani, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. II (1968-69), pp. 280-81.
112. *The Nāṭyaśāstra* edited and translated by Dr. M. Ghose, Vols. I-II (Chapter I-XXVII), *ibid.*, pp. 287-89.
113. *Studies in Kushāna Genealogy and Chronology*, Vol. I—*The Kushāna Genealogy* by Dr. B. N. Mukherjee, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLVI, Part II, August 1968, pp. 296-97.
114. *The Indianised States of South-East Asia* by G. Coedes, edited by W. F. Vella and translated by S. B. Cowing, *ibid.*, pp. 310-11.
115. *Ajmer through Inscription (1532-1852)* by S. A. I. Tirmizi, *ibid.*, Part III, December 1968, pp. 416-18.
116. *Studies in Indology*, Vol. I, by Dr. V. V. Mirashi, *ibid.*, pp. 426-27.
117. *German Indology—Past and Present* by G. D. Sontheimer and H. V. Stieteneron, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. III (1969-70), pp. 295-96.
118. *Koch- Rājyaṁśi Śātir Itihāsa āru Saṁkṛiti* Assamese by A. C. Sarkar, *ibid.*, pp. 301-03.
119. *Economic Life in Northern India in the Gupta Period (Cir. A.D. 300-550)*, 2nd ed., by Dr. S. K. Maity, *ibid.*, pp. 303-04.
120. *Decipherment of Proto-Dravidian Inscriptions of the Indus Civilization (First Announcement) and Progress in Decipherment of Proto-Dravidian Indus Script* by Dr. Asko Parpola and others, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XIX, Nos. 1-2, September-December, 1969, pp. 176-78.

121. *Studies in Kushāna Genealogy and Chronology* by Dr. B.N. Mukerjee, *ibid.*, No.4, June, 1970, pp. 448-49.
122. *Chaitanya: his Life and Doctrine—A Study in Vaishnavism* by Dr. A.K. Majumdar, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLVII, Part II, August, 1969, pp. 433-35.
123. *Āryataṅgiṇī—The Saga of the Indo-Aryans*, Vol. I, by A. Kalyanaraman, *ibid.*, pp. 444-45.
124. *Excavations at Ahar (Tambavati)* by Drs. H.D. Sankalia S.B. Deo and Z.D. Ansari, *ibid.*, Vol. XLVIII, Part I, April 1970, pp. 196-97.
125. *Ethnology of Ancient Bhārata* by R.C. Jain, *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XX, No.3, March, 1971, pp. 321-23.
126. *Nana on Lion—A Study in Kushāna Numismatic Art* by Dr. B. N. Mukherjee, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. IV, (1970-71), pp. 345-46.
127. *A Guide to the Temple Tokens of India* by Irwin F. Brotman, *ibid.*, pp. 346-48.
128. *India as seen in the Brihatsaṃhitā of Varāhamihira* by Dr. A.M. Shastri, *ibid.*, pp. 348-49.
129. *The Yādavas and their Times* by Dr. O.P. Verma, *ibid.*, pp. 349-41.
130. *An Agrippan Source—A Study of Indo. Parthian History* by Dr. B.N. Mukherjee, *ibid.*, pp. 350-52.
131. *Pāsupatasūtram* by Dr. H.P. Chakraborti, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLVIII, Part III, December 1970, pp. 710-12.
132. *Excavations at Nagara* by Dr. R.N. Mehta and others, *ibid.*, Vol. XLIX, December, 1971, pp. 349-51.
133. *Evaluation of Hindu Sects* by Prof. S. Chattopadhyaya, *ibid.*, 363-70.
134. *India and Ethiopia from the Seventh Century B.C.* by Prof. S.K. Chatterjee, *Journ. As. Soc.*, Vol. XII, 1970, p. 170.
135. *History of Ancient Bengal* by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol.V (1971-72), pp. 391-97.
136. *Political Centres and Culture Regions in Early Bengal* by Dr. B.M. Morrison, *ibid.*, pp. 397-99.
137. *Harsha and his Times* by Dr. B.N. Sharma, *ibid.*, pp. 401-03.
138. *Proceedings of the Twentysixth International Congress of Orientalists*, 1964, Vol. III, Part II edited by Dr. R.N. Dandekar, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. L, Part III, December, 1972, pp. 879-80.

INDEX

A

Abhaṭa 131
 Abhinanda 98, 99, 100, 101
 Abhinavagupta 102
 Abhona plates 71
 Ādhai-din-ka-Jhompda 117, 118
 Adhyayadevaśarmman 129
 Ādideva 101
 Ādinātha 40
 Ādityas 110
 Ādityavarman 44
 Agastya 110
Agni Purāṇa 57
 Ahicchatra 1
 Ain-i-Akbari 161
 Airikina 47
 Ajanta inscriptions 63
 Ajayameru 118
 Ajayarāja 118
 Akālajalada 112
 Akara 107
 Akbar 17
 Akṣauhiṇī 40
 Alaṅkāra nirūpaṇa 58
 Alauddin Sultan 108
 Allahabad pillar inscriptions 61, 63
 Amarakosa 56, 103, 104
 Anandapura 71
 Anangabhīma III 139, 152, 154
 Anāṅgaranga 133
 Anantavarman 44, 45, 50, 51, 149, 152, 154
Anargharāghava 58
 Aṅgas 46
 Aniyāṅkabhīma (Vajrahasta II) 44, 45
 Anjaneri 71, 72
 Anu 46
 Anuṣṭubh 61
 Āpnuvat 129
 Ariṣṭanemi 37
 Arjuna 66
Arthaśāstra 73, 76, 77, 79, 80
Arthavivṛti 103

Āryabhaṭa 35, 40
 Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa 100
 Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā 100
 Aśoka 1, 3, 14, 15, 16
Aśokavadāna 55
Āṣṭādhyāyī 40, 51
Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā 100
 Āśvaghoṣa 61
Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra 39
 Auli Karas 87
 Aurangzib 15
 Aurva 129
 Ayodhya 42, 45

B

Bidāmi 44, 72
 Badāuni 108
 Bāhlika 38
 Bāhu 42, 170
 Bālāditya 44
 Balarāma-Saṅkaṣaṇa 119
 Bālavalabhi 102, 103
 Bālavalabhībhujaṅga 101, 102, 103
 Ballālasena 123
 Baṇa-bhaṭṭa 10, 11, 64
 Bandhuvarman 61
 Bannahallī plates 66
 Bahharāval, 171
 Barabar cave inscription 50
 Beef-eating Hindus 172
 Belva plate 119
 Bennur plate 66
 Bhagadatta 40
Bhāgavata Purāṇa 41, 110
 Bhagiratha 68
Bhaktibhāgavata 136, 137, 140, 142, 143
Bhaktivaibhava 142, 143, 144
 Bhamodra-Mohota plate 87
 Bhānu III 45
 Bhānu IV 45
 Bhānugupta 87
 Bhāraśiva 63
 Bhārata 56, 57

Bhavāni Rani, 159, 161, 167, 165, 166
Bhārgava 129
Bhāravi 63
Bhāṣavṛtti 103, 104
Bhāsvat 108
Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita 52
Bhaumakara 44
Bhavadeva 99, 101, 102, 139
Bhavānī 92
Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa 95, 97, 98
Bhayillaswamin, }
Bhaillasvāmin } 107, 108 111, 113, 115
Bbailasvamin }
Bhilsā (Bhelsa) 107, 111
Bhitari pillar inscription 49
Bhogaśakti 72
Bhoja 112
Bhoja I Ādivarāha 115
Bhojaprabandh 112
Bhojavarman 119
Bhr̥ṅgarikā 103
Bimbisāra 94
Bodhisattvā vadānakalpalatā 10
Brahmagupta 110
Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa 36, 41, 42
Brhadbala 42
Brhad-Bāṇas 68
Brhadratha 10, 11, 12
Brhajjātaka 58
Brhaspatismṛti 75, 76
Brahatsambhīṣa 58, 59, 110
Buddha 39, 42, 45, 64, 118
Buddhacaritā 61
Buddhagupta 87
Buddharāja 71

C

Cacciāka 113
Cāhamāna (cauhana) 117, 118, 119
Caitanyacaritamṛta 141
Calukyas 37, 39, 44, 45, 63
Cakrapālita 50
Cāmtamūla I 64
Cañcalakṣita 57
Caṇḍasena 91, 92
Candella 108
Candavṛṣṭiprapāta 59
Candra 111
Candragupta I 47, 91, 93, 94, 97, 98
Candragupta II 33, 49, 66, 98
Candrāloka 58
Candraśrī 97
Chandomañjari 57, 58
Chikkulla 64
Chinnamma 111
Chitrama 111

Chittapa 111, 112
Chittipa 111
Codagaṅga 44, 45
Cyavana 129

D

Dadda I 71
Daksinātya 112
Dalbhyas 33
Dānāṇava 44
Daṇḍaka 59
Daṇḍimahādevi 49
Daṇḍin 62, 63
Daśapura 49 61
Daśaratha 42
Daśarna 107
Dayitaviṣṇu 98
Demetrius 6, 7, 10, 12
Devakī 38
Devala 173
Devangere 67
Devapāla 49, 98, 101
Devarāja (Devagupta) 98
Devicandragupta 11
Dhamamita 6, 7, 10
Dhanvantari 175
Dhara 107
Dharāṣena II 71
Dharāṣena IV 87
Dharma 131
Dharmāditya 89, 91
Dharmapāla 98, 100
Dhiniki 85
Dhṛtaraṣṭra 38
Dhrūbhata 71
Dhrūvabhata 71
Dhruvasena 69
Dhruvasena II Bālāditya 71
Dirghatamas 46
Divyavadāna 81
Dodhaka 18
Droṇasimhā 87
Druhya 46
Dudia 63
Durgāsaptāśati 52
Dvāpara 35, 43
Dvirupakoṣa 104

E

East India Company 162
Ekākṣara-Kosa 104, 105, 111
Ekānamśā 92
Eucratides 12
Euthydemus 6, 10

G

Gagu 131
 Gajapati 43
 Gandharva 95
Gandhaśāstra 101
 Gaṅga 43, 44, 154
 Gaṅgādāsa 57, 58
 Gangadhara 49
 Ganga dynasty 149, 154, 155, 157
 Gaṅgavādī 41
 Ganges 10, 100
 Gangeva 44
Gārgīśamhita 1, 15
Garuḍa Purāṇa 95
 Gauda 44, 89
 Gaudalekhamālā 48, 50
 Gautama 42
 Gautamīputra Śātakarmī 19
 Ghatotkaca 92, 97, 98
Gitagovinda 58
 Gopacandra 89
 Gopāla 93
 Gopāla II 100
 Govardhana 19
Gṛhyasūtra 38, 39
 Guhila 171, 172
 Guṇamahārṇava 44
 Guṇārṇava 44, 45
 Gundama 44
 Guṇḍama I, 44
 Guṇḍama II 45
 Gupta 44
 Gurjjara 71

H

Haladhara 119
 Halāyudha 126, 127, 128
 Halayudhadevaśarman 129
 Halkī 66
 Hammīra-Mahākāvya 119
 Hanumat 111
Harakeli nāṭaka 117
 Harappa 46
Hārāvali 104, 105
 Hāra Varṣa 98, 100
 Hāra Varṣa Mahipāla I 99
 Hari 59
 Haridāsa 132
 Hariseṇa 51, 62, 63
Harivaṃśa Purāṇa 17, 42, 89
 Harivarman 102, 103
 Harṣ 71, 89
Harṣacrita 64
 Harṣagupṭā 94
 Harun Chisti 132

Hastinibhitta 101
 Hatiāka 113, 116
 Hemacandra 111
 Hieuen-tsang 71, 94
 Hou-Han-Shu 14
 Hūnas 87
 Hypanis (Vipaśa) 10

I

Ikṣvāku 41, 42, 43, 46, 64, 118
 Itutmiṣh (Sultān) 108, 117
 Indra 66, 119
Indravajra 18
 Indus Valley 46
 Ipur 64, 65
 Īśanavarman 88, 94

J

Jadi-Vasaha (Yati Vṛṣabh) 90
 Jagannātha temple 43, 149
 Jabāngir 98
 Jāikadeva 85
 Jamadagnya (Paraśurāma) 118, 129
 Jantāvūra 44
 Jayadeva 57, 58, 119
 Jayāditya 51
 Jayanāga 89, 91
 Jayāñka 119
 Jayanta-bhatta 99, 101
 Jayasimha 45
 Jevidāsa (Devīdasa) 132
 Jivadeva 136, 137, 142, 143
 Jinasena 89
 Jitāñkuśa 44
 Jivadeva 136, 137, 142, 143
 Junagadh 50, 55, 61, 62

K

Kāca 98
Kādumbarī kathāsara 99, 101
 Kadambas 63, 65, 66, 67, 68
 Kahola 39
 Kajangala 8
 Kajjala 31
 Kakusthavarman 66, 67, 68
 Kalacuris 71, 87, 100
 Kalhana 36, 43, 44, 45, 169
 Kali age (Kali Yuga) 2, 8, 9, 35, 36, 43
 Kālīdāsa 61, 62, 63, 132
 Kaligalāñkuśa 44
 Kalīṅga 13, 44, 45, 46, 89
 Kalinga nagāra 158
 Kalkin 118

Kalyāṇavarman 45, 92, 93, 94
 Kāmārṇava 44
Kāmarūpaśaṇāvali 48, 51, 110
Kāmaśūtra 6
 Kambhojas 170
 Kāñcī 68, 94
 Kāñcīpura 18
 Kandhāra 171
 Kaṇḍavarman 68
 Kaṇṣka 61
 Kaṇva 41, 129
 Kapilendra (Kapileśvara) 45, 141, 150
 Karkota 169
Karmānuṣṭānapaddhati 101
 Kārṇakesarin 135
 Kaṇṇarājendra 136
 Kārṇasuvārṇa 89
 Karṭtakṛtika 69
 Kāśī 50
 Kāśikā 51
 Katāhanagara 94
Kaṭhasaritsagura 37, 95
 Katyāyana 17
 Katyāyanasarodhāra 76
Kaumudimahotsava 91, 92, 94, 95
 Kauravas 40
 Kausambī 57
 Kautilya 73, 76, 77, 80
Kavindra vacana samuccaya 111
Kāvyaadarśa 63
Kāvyaaprakāśa 102
 Kesarī 43, 44, 149, 151
 Khalimpur plate 48
Khaṇḍanakhāḍya 110
 Khāravela 62
 Khurram 98
Kirātārjunīya 6
 Kīrtimati 92, 93
 Kīrtisena 92, 94
 Kola (Varāha) 118
 Kolāhala 44, 45
 Kolāhalapura 44
 Koṇārka 140
 Kośala 42
 Kṛṣṇa (god) 46, 118, 119, 142
 Kṛṣṇa (king) 71, 107
Kṛṣṇacarita 95
 Kṛṣṇadāsa 141
 Kṛṣṇavarman II, 66
 Kṛṣṇa 35, 43
 Kṣemendra 10
 Kṣīrasvāmin 56
 Kṣudraka 42
 Kubera 18
 Kulaka 42
 Kumāradevī 97
 Kumāragupta I 61, 98

Kumārila bhaṭṭa 101
 Kumbha 41
 Kunda 132
 Kūrma 118
 Kuru 36, 38, 40
 Kurukṣetra 35
 Kuru-Pāñcalas 35
 Kuṣāṇa 33, 93
 Kuṣītaka 39
 Kusumapura 92

L

Lakṣmanasena 66, 103, 104, 112, 119, 123
 Lakshmeshwar 72
 Lakṣmī (goddess) 51
 Lakṣmīdhara 143
Lalitavigraharāja-nāṭaka 117
 Laṅguliya Nṛsimha 140
 Licchavis 91, 92, 94, 97
 Lohāto 69, 72
 Lohātakagrāma 72, 85
 Lokapālas 18
 Lokavigraha 90

M

Mādala Pañjī 43, 44, 133, 135, 136, 137, 140, 149, 150, 150, 152, 158
 Madanvarman 108
 Madhavavarman I, 64, 171
 Madhukāmārṇava 44, 45
 Madhyadeśa 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12
 Māgadeva 131, 132
 Māgarāja 131, 132
Māgarājapaddhati 131, 132
 Māgha 36, 37
Mahābhārata 19, 38
Mahābhāṣya 3, 4, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 51, 52, 55, 61
 Mahākośal 42
 Mahapadma 36, 39, 42
 Mahapadmanand 36, 37, 41
 Mahārāja 131
 Mahasthan 8
 Mahāśvagupta-Bālarjuna 94
 Mahāvīra 38
 Mahēśvara 128
 Mahipāla 100
 Mahipāla I 50, 99
Mahipāla Vacah 19
Maitraka 69, 71, 87
Majjhimanikāya 39
 Malati 18, 61
 Maleccha 173
 Maltinātha 110

Manināta 102
 Māna 44, 91
 Mandasor 61, 87
 Māṇḍavya 59
 Maṅgata 131
 Manora (Manorā) 131
 Mantragupta 92
 Manu 8, 42, 43, 46
Manusmṛti 70, 75, 77, 81
 Mārasimha 44
Markandeya Purāṇa 52, 95
 Masar 89
 Mathura 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 13, 33, 55, 92, 93, 94, 107
Matsya Purāṇa 13, 36, 41, 42
 Maukharī 55, 88
 Maukharī Anantavarman 49
 Maurya 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15
 Mayūrākṣaka 49, 50
 Mayūraśarman 68
 Mihirakula 87
Milindapañha 56
 Mina 118
Minhājuddin 108
 Mīr Jafar 162
 Mitakṣrā 48, 73, 79
 Mitra 110
 Moon 44
 Mr̥gesvaravarman 66
 Mr̥tyuñjaya 138
 Muazzama 98
 Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq 132
 Mukṭāpīḍa (Lalitaditya) 101
 Mukundadeva 144
 Mummunirāja 100
 Munindra 104
 Munīakhāb-ut-Tawarikh 108

N

Nāga kings 93, 169
Nagannikā 18, 61
 Nāgavamśī 169
 Nāgara 44
 Nāgarjuni Cave 49, 51
 Nāgarjuni Konda 64
Naisadhya 100, 111, 137
 Nanaghat 18, 61
Nanda 36, 41
 Nanda Kumār 159
 Nāndīpurī 71
 Nāñṣimha 130, 153, 155
Nāradasmyti 79, 82
 Narasimha II, 133, 153
 Narasimha IV, 133
 Narāyaṇa 115

Nāsika 19, 61, 62, 63
 Nātharāja 132
Nāthudeva 131
 Nātor 166
Nātyaśāstra 17, 56, 57
 Navakara 112
 Nayacandra 119
 Nicandā 32
 Nihśaṅka Bhānu 140
 Nilakantha 132, 133
 Nilmatha 44
Nilamata Purāṇa 44
 Nilamuni 44
Nirṇayāmṛta 101
 Nonaryan 46
 Nṛsimha 118, 139
 Nṛsimha I 140
 Nṛsimha II 140
 Nyāyamañjri 99

P

Pahlava (Parthian) 61
 Pāla 98
 Palibothra 68
 Pallava 68
 Pampā-saras 92
 Pañcala 1, 4, 7; 8, 10, 13, 38, 40
 Pāṇḍava 36, 40, 43
 Paṇini 3, 17, 40, 51
 Paravāḍa 113
 Parbatīya plates 48, 51
 Parikṣit 36, 37, 39, 40, 45
 Pārvati 58
 Pāṭaligrama 10
 Pataliputra 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 35, 59, 91, 94
 Patañjali 3, 15, 17, 19, 51, 52, 55, 61
 Paṇḍravardhana 89
 Pauravas 46
 Pingala 55, 56, 57
 Pīthi 104
 Polamuru plates 64, 65
 Poona plate 63
 Prabhavatigupta 63
 Pragjyotisa 40, 48
Praharṣini 18, 61
Prakṛtānuśāsana 104
 Pramitakṣara 18, 61
 Prasenañjit 42, 43, 45
 Prataparudra 136, 141, 142, 143, 150
 Pratisthān 170
 Pravarasena II (Vakatāka) 63, 64, 98
Prāyaścittaprakaraṇa 101
 Preharā 68
 Pṛthvīcandra Bhogaśakti 71

Prthivimahadevī 49
 Prthivi-Vigraha-bhāṭṭaraka 89, 90
Prthivīrajavijaya 119
 Pulakeśin 44
 Pulomau 37
 Puṣumavī 19, 61, 62
 Puṇḍras 46
 Pundravardhana 8
 Puragupta (Purugupta) 98
 Pūranavarman 94
 Pūri 46
 Puruṣotlana 57, 58, 59, 99, 103, 104, 141
 150
 Puṣpapura 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13,
 Puṣya 37
 Puṣyabhūti 89
 Puṣyamitra Sunga 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17,
 18, 19, 92, 98

Q

Qutbuddīn Aibak 117

R

Rādha 101, 103
 Raghu 68
Raghuvamśa 110
 Rāhu 109, 111
 Rāhula 42
Rajamāta 43, 44
 Rājasekhara 100
Rājatarangini 43, 44, 45, 69, 70, 74, 75,
 78, 80, 83
 Rājyapāla 102, 136
 Rāma 188
Rāmacarita 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 136
 Rāmagupta 11
 Rāmapāla 102, 136
 Rāmāyana 18, 42, 52
 Rāṣṭrakūṭas 100, 107
 Rāra 59
 Ratnagiri Copper plate 136
 Ratnavatī 142
 Ravikīrti 63
 Ravivarman 67
 Ray, Nandakumār 160, 161
R̥gveda (RK) 56, 68
 Rśabhanātha 40
 Rudra 41
 Rudradāman 55, 62
 Rudradāman I 62, 67

S

Śaba-Virasena 49, 66

Sadānana 68
 Sāgara 42, 170
 Sahagala 131
 Sāhana 131
 Śailendra 94, 102
 Śailodbhava 44
 Śaka 42, 55, 67, 170
 Śakambharī 117
 Śaka Rśabhadatta 19
 Śaka-Satrapas 55
 Śaketa 2, 3, 9, 10, 13
 Śaktisvāmin 101
 Śakya 42
 Salim 98
 Sālīni 13
 Śālīsuka 1, 13, 14
Śaṣṭrabhyudaya 143
 Samācāradeva 89, 91
 Samāni 18
Sambandhaviveka 101
Sāmavda 68
 Samavṛtta 57
 Sambhava 131
 Sampati 13, 14
 Samudragupta 47, 61, 67, 95, 97, 98
 Sandhyakaranandin 102, 103, 136
 Sañjaya 42
 Śaṅkargaṇa 71
 Śāntivarman 65, 67, 68
 Śarabodhinī 102
 Śarnāth Stone inscription 50
Sarasvatī kathanābharana 112
 Śārdulavarman 50
 Śaśaṅka 78, 89, 91
Śāsvatakośa 111
 Śātakarṇī 41
 Satananda 101
 Satanandi 99
 Śātavāhanas 37, 41, 62, 64, 97, 98, 170
 Satrap Nahapana 19
 Satya 43
 Saumya 95
 Śesanāga 110
 Shāh Alam 98, 162
 Shāh Jahan 98
Siddhānta kaumudī 52
 Siddharta 42
 Sikkhandin 38
 Śitaditya I Dharmaditya 71
 Śilāditya III 70, 171
 Śilahārachittarāja 100
 Simhadatta 111
 Simuka 41
 Sirpur Lakṣmana temple inscription 88, 94
Śiśupālavadha 114
 Śiva (god) 49, 58, 59, 68, 104, 105
 Śivagupta (Mahāśivagupta) Balarjuna 88

Sivaji 15
 Siyadonī inscription 114
 Skandagupta 49, 50
 Skanda Purāṇa 53
 Soddhala 100
 Somadeva 117, 171
 Somavamśī 43, 44, 151, 157
 Someśvara 139
 Śragdharā 59
 Śrīdharadāsa 112
 Śrīpārvatiya Andhras 97
 Srñjayas 38, 40
 Sṛṣṭidhara 103
 Sthānakundura 68
 Sthiragupta 98
 Stūpāvadāna 10
 Subbaṣitaratnakosa 111
 Sudarśana 50
 Suddhodana 42
 Sudhāsāgara 102, 103
 Suhmas 46
 Sumitra 42
 Sundaravarman 91, 92
 Sungas 10
 Sūrasena 94
 Surāṣṭrā 13, 61
 Surathā 42
 Sūrya-sena 128, 130
 Sūryasiddhānta 110
 Sūrya Vamsī 149
 Suryavarman 88, 94
 Śuśarman 41
 Svarabhānu 111
 Svetamaṇḍavya 57, 59

T

Tabaqat-i-Nāṣirī 108
 Talagunda 65, 67, 68
Tautatitamatatilaka 101
 Tejovarma 72
 Tejpur plates 48
Tikāsarvasva 103
 Tiloyapaṇṇatti (Trilokaprajñapti) 90, 91
Tīrtha-yātrā 19
Tīthi-niryāna 101
Toramāna 87
Toṭaka 18
 Tretā 35, 43
 Tribhuvanapāla 100
 Trikaṇḍaśeṣa 104, 105
 Trilocana 141
 Tripuradāsa 131, 132
 Turvasu 45, 46

U

Udayāditya Paramāra 108
 Udayana 39, 45

Udayagiri 109
 Udayagiri I Cave Inscription 49, 66
Udayasundarī Kathā 100
 Uddyotakesarin 153, 136, 137, 139
 Ujjayinī 18, 55, 107
 Umāpatidhara 66
 Upajāti 18
 Utpala 110
 Uttarapatha 8, 9

V

Vacharāja 131
 Vaṇnagar 71
 Vaidarbhī 62, 63
Vaidyahrdayananda 132, 133
 Vaiśampāyana 38
 Vaivasvata 43
 Vajrahasta I 44
 Vajrahasta II (Aniyāṅkabhīma) 41, 45
 Vajrahasta III 44, 45
 Vajrahasta IV 44, 45
 Vajrahasta V 45
 Vakātaka 41, 62, 63
 Valabhi 69, 37
 Vallabhvidyanagar 1
 Vālmiki 100
 Vāmadeva 140
 Vamana 51, 95, 118
Vaṁśasthavila 18
 Vanamā'avarman 48, 50
 Vandyaghatiya Sarvaṇand 103, 104, 105
 Vanjas 46
 Varaha 124, 174
 Varahamihira 36, 37, 40
 Varahasamhita 110
 Varuṇa 18, 110
 Vasantatilaka 18, 47, 61
 Vasata 94
 Vāsava 18
 Vāsiṣṭhiputra 62, 63
Vastrāpātha-Mahatmya 53
 Vasudeva 141
 Vatsa (Vasiṣṭha) 119
 Vatsabhatri 61, 62
 Vatsarāja 66
 Vātsyāyana 6
Vāyu Purāṇa 36, 41, 42, 93, 95
 Vengī 39
 Vetravati 108
 Vicitravīrya 38
 Vidarbha 61, 62
 Vidhi 59
 Vidiśā (Vaidīśa) 19, 107,
 Vidyākara 111
 Vidyumālā 18
 Vīgraha 44, 91
 Vīgraharāja IV, 117

Vijayasena 103, 171
 Vijñāneśvara 48, 79
 Vikrama 132
 Vikrama I 133
 Vikrama II 133
 Vikrama III 134
 Vikramāditya II 72, 170, 174, 175
 Vikramapura 103
 Vikramaśīla 100, 101
 Vinayāditya 44
 Vindhyaśakti 41
 Vindhyavāsini 92
 Vipāśa (Hypanis) 10
 Virarudra 141, 142
 Vīrasimha 44
 Virocana 44
 Virudhava 42
 Viṣṇu (author) 73, 79,
 Viṣṇu (god) 45, 51, 105, 108, 110, 115,
 118, 119, 124
 Viṣṇubhaṭṭa 69, 71, 85
 Viṣṇukunḍin 64
Viṣṇu Purāṇa 36, 41, 93, 95
 Viṣṇusena 69, 70, 71, 72
Viṣṇusmṛti 48, 79
 Viṣṇuvardhana 171
 Viṣṇuvarman 66, 67
 Viśvavarman 49, 51

Viśvarūpasena 123, 126, 128, 129
 Vo-canḥ inscription 33
 Vṛddha Garga 36
Vyavahāratilaka 101

Y

Yādava 45, 46
 Yadu 46
 Yajñasena 38
 Yājñavalkya 79
Yājñavalkyasmṛti 48, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79,
 80, 81
Yajus-Veda 68, 129
 Yama 18
 Yaśaskara 99, 101
 Yaśodharman 87
 Yati-Vṛṣabha (dadi-Vasaha) 90
 Yavanas 1, 8, 9, 10, 12, 42, 170
 Yayāti 46
 Yayāti Kesarin 136
 Yayātinagara (Yayātipura) 139
 Yogasiddhi 92
 Yogavāsīṣṭha-Rāmāyaṇa 99, 101
Yogavāsīṣṭhasārā 99
 Yudhiṣṭhira 43
Yuga Purāṇa 1-16



A. B.	Bhakti Ratnawali	30 00
Chandra, Moti	Costumes Textiles Cosmetics and Coiffure in Ancient and Medieval India	80.00
Dubois, J. A.	Hindu Manners Customs & Ceremonies	40.00
Elphinstone	Territories Conquered from Paishwa	30.00
Gupta, S. P.	Disposal of the Dead & Physical Types in Ancient India	80.00
Gupta, & Lal, K.	Tourism Museums and Monuments in India	
Hunter, W. W.	Indian Empire : Its people history and products	75.00
Hunter, W. W.	A Brief History of Indian People	35.00
Hunter, W. W.	A Comparative Dictionary of Non-Aryan Languages of India and High Asia	60.00
Ker, J. C.	Political Trouble in India 1907-17 : A confidential report	60.00
Muller, Max	The Upanishads Katha, Mundaka, Taittiriya, Brihadaranyaka, Svetasvatra, Prasna and Maitrayana	10.00
Narula, S. S.	Social roots of Indian Linguistics	35 00
Pandey, D. C.	The Shahis of Afghanistan & Punjab	40.00
Powell, B.H.Baden	The Land Systems of British India 3 Vols.	225.00
Puri, J. L. (Ed.)	Buddhist Heritage of Afghanistan	45.00
Risely, H. H.	The Gazetteer of Sikkim	75.00
Sastri K. A. N.	Aspects of India's History and Culture	80.00
Sircar, D. C.	Studies in Yagapurana and Other Texts	90.00
Sircar, D. C.	Studies in Medieval Inscriptions of Eastern India	45.00
Sircar, J. N.	Studies in Economic Life in Mughal India	50.00
Tandon, P. D. & Others	History of Hindu Muslim Problem in India	60.00
Vasistha, H. B.	Revenue and Administrative System of the Maharattas	35.00
Vasu, S. C.	Narad Siksha & Sandilya Sutram (Eng. Trans.)	40.00
Vasu, S. C.	Isa, Kena, Katha, Mundaka, Manduka Upanishad Text with Eng. Trans.	50.00
Wadell, L. A.	Lamaism in Sikkim	50.00
Younghusband, F.	Northern Frontier of Kashmir	30.00

ORIENTAL PUBLISHERS

1488, PATAUDI HOUSE, DARYAGANJ,
DELHI-110006 (INDIA)